[redacted]

**From:** Diego Denis [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:35 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Diego Denis

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Joelle Robinson [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:32 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Joelle Robinson

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:30 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Glenn Hill [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:29 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Julia Salnicki

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Adam Marinovic [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:28 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Adam Marinovic

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Audrey Pfister [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:28 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Audrey Pfister

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Julia Salnicki [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:27 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Julia Salnicki

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Kyle Su [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:27 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

_____



[redacted]

**From:** Liam Casey [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:25 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

This project is wasteful, and aims to solve problems that could be more easily and cheaply addressed by improving and increasing public transport connections. Sydney cannot continue to grow and build more and more mega-roads and mega-suburbs - we need to adapt and be able to move our population quickly and rapidly through mass transit systems like those in Tokyo, London, Berlin, Copenhagen, Melbourne, Paris, and other major cities.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Liam Casey

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Jacqui Duncan [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:19 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jacqui Duncan

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Bruce McWhinney [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:13 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Bruce McWhinney

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Andrea Connor [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:13 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Andrea Connor

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** michael sabljic [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:13 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

NSW government should be spending taxpayer money on building infrastructure to support jobs out west, not to bring more congestion to an already congested inner western Sydney and southern industrial area.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

_____



[redacted]

**From:** jeremy roper-tyler [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:12 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

jeremy roper-tyler

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Enno Hermann [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:11 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Enno Hermann

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** aaron pankhurst [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:06 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

aaron pankhurst

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Dana Sabljic [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:05 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I believe the government should consider alternative transport solutions rather than building the westconnex, such as more buses and trains running every 5 to10 minutes during peak hour.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Dana Sabljic

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Gabriel Haythornthwaite [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 7:03 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I live in Haberfield and work in Pyrmont. Travel times to work in the mornings:

- by light rail 25-25 minutes

- cycling 20 minutes

- by car 20 (school holidays) - 90 minutes (normal working days).

Driving it was quicker for me to drive to work in Artarmon (via the iron cove bridge and river road) than it is now that our office has moved to Pyrmont.

Any analysis will show traffic to the city between 6:30 and 10am on the existing City Westlink is close to a standstill on most working days of the year. Traffic simply can't exit the road into city working destinations fast enough. Delivering yet more traffic onto the city westlink morning peak period can only exacerbate this problem.

In the evening the problem is every bit as bad. It can take over 40 minutes to get onto the ANZAC bridge from Pyrmont because the traffic on the bridge is already close to a standstill because of the volume of traffic and the traffic lights in Glebe and Leichhardt, and the feeds onto the bridge from Bridge Road and Wattle Street queue back along the feeder ramp and in effect block access to the ANZAC bridge from Pyrmont to ~6 cars per change of lights.

Without addressing these "downstream" problems building Westconnex will slow rather than improve road access to the city from the inner west. I can see a strong case for investing in better public transport links that will take traffic off the roads. I can see no sentient case for exacerbating an already close to interable problem in the inner west by adding yet more city bound feeder roads, traffic and polution.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was

unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives

in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Gabriel Haythornthwaite

[redacted]



[redacted] 11818

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:51 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Michelle Hines [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:47 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Michelle Hines

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Catherine Wegrzyn [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:41 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

Our home is located off the Southern end of Homer Street near to Bexley Road. It is already near impossible to exit our street in the afternoons as traffic banks all the way up the hill toward Earlwood Public School. I have great difficulty trying to leave to pick my children up from preschool and school in a safe manner because of this. Traffic through the centre of Earlwood is bad at the best of times and ridiculous during peak hour and school times due to the poor placement and programming of traffic lights through the 5 ways intersection and Homer Street shops. Adding increased traffic through the area due to people avoiding high tolls is at significant detriment to our suburb that has already been impacted by a major motorway and sparse (and highly unreliable) public transport. It is also going to be increasingly hazardous and dangerous for the many parents and school students that are pedestrians on an already busy Homer Street.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Wegrzyn

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Rosa Gollan [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:35 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Rosa Gollan

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Fleur James [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:35 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Fleur James

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Jenny Alexander [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:31 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jenny Alexander

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] 11824

**From:** Kimberley Alexander [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:30 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Kimberley Alexander

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Alex Kaufman [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:29 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Alex Kaufman

[redacted]

[redacted] 11826

**From:** Kim Kaufman [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:26 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Kim Kaufman

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Hana Patrick [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:23 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Hana Patrick

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Ben Rowley [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:23 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Ben Rowley

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Simon Cahill [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:20 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Families and communities are being ripped apart without a clean and ten parent analysis of what this means for the people of NSW. It's is irresponsible, deceptive and damaging to the people it is meant to be protecting.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will

substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport

component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Simon Cahill

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:19 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

_____



[redacted]

**From:** Margaret Frisk [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:18 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret Frisk

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Dan Giangrande [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:08 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Dan Giangrande

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Lilja Marinovic [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 8:07 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Lilja Marinovic

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Jenni Donohoe [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:53 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

WestConnex as proposed is the wrong solution at the wrong time for Sydney. It is out of

step with international best practice when it comes to transport policy and the creating

liveable, economically viable cities in the 21st century.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. WestConnex will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW will use. If its huge and rapidly escalating $16.8 billion cost was invested in more sustainable transport options instead, such as public transport improvements in western and south-west Sydney, better management of Sydney's existing roads, and so on it would not only be likely to reduce congestion and improve mobility in our capital. It would also free up much-needed public funds for improving roads, public transport, schools and hospitals in regional NSW. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or

omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

We recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project, particularly as contracts have already been signed for the New M5 ahead of such approval being granted. We remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jenni Donohoe

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Greg Ricketson [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:50 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

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

o The New M5 will dump over 100,000 cars and trucks in Inner West suburbs, many of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional.

o There has been no consultation with businesses in King St and other parts of Inner Sydney. King Street's thriving street life would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances that clearways won't be created are worthless.

o It's outrageous that Euston Road would be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a polluted road should be bought to within several metres of existing bedrooms.

o The EIS ignores the work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that Westconnex won't meet its time-saving or congestion goals

o I object to the fact that no serious traffic modelling has been done outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project.

o Roads and Maritimes Services was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected critically endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants to destroy that same flora and fauna for a new tollway because its old project failed to solve congestion. This would make the system of conditions meaningless.

o I object to a weak consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims. The public deserves evidence based analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management.

o Billion dollar contracts have been awarded to tollway companies although the government is aware that local government election bodies and many experts are convinced Westconnex won't deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

o AECOM which has a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to do this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on Westconnex going ahead. This is an unacceptable conflict of interest.

o There is already insufficient parking in the Inner West. I objects to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for years of construction.

o I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

o I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

o I object to the removal of part of Sydney Park and replacing its beautiful paper bark trees with polluting traffic.

o I object to a selection of tunnelling methods that prioritise construction timelines against the risk of vibration damage to residents' property.

o I object to the use of an air quality model that hasn't been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals, including near schools. It 's not acceptable for a government to deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Greg Ricketson

[redacted]

---

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:55 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788
Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

As someone whose home is being compulsorily acquired for this project, I have firsthand experience of how the proponent will blatantly lie in order to get this project forced through. We approached the proponent when it was still the WestConnex Delivery Authority (WDA) before we bought our home in St Peters in July 2014. We asked them specifically about whether this project "WestConnex" that we'd heard about as part of our due diligence would impact our property. We were told there were no current plans.

So you can imagine our shock and horror when we received a knock on the door less than 2 months after we moved in to the property on Melbourne Cup Day 2014 (always a prime time for governments to bury wrongdoing) to be told our house was slated to acquisition and demolition to make way for this project.

Since then I have heard the proponents, as well as Premier Mike Baird and Roads Minister Duncan Gay, make further statements that I know to be untrue - including assertions that families like mine whose homes and businesses are being acquired across the WestConnex route are being treated fairly, when scores of families and indeed a recent *Sydney Morning Herald* investigation make it clear we are not.

This EIS is another example of how the proponents of this project attempt to omit or arrogantly misrepresent information in order to try and force the project through. The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

WestConnex as proposed is the wrong solution at the wrong time for Sydney. It is out of step with international best practice when it comes to transport policy and the creating liveable, economically viable cities in the 21st century.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an

independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. WestConnex will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW will use. If its huge and rapidly escalating $16.8 billion cost was invested in more sustainable transport options instead, such as public transport improvements in western and south-west Sydney, better management of Sydney's existing roads, and so on it would not only be likely to reduce congestion and improve mobility in our capital. It would also free up much-needed public funds for improving roads, public transport, schools and hospitals in regional NSW. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution

levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best

option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

We recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project, particularly as contracts have already been signed for the New M5 ahead of such approval being granted. We remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:46 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS). I strongly endorse the statement by the City of Sydney that this EIS is so profoundly inadequate that provides not reasonable basis for Ministerial approval.

I have been a resident of inner Sydney since 1967. I have a strong interest in planning and environmental issues. I am also a journalist. The promotional and slip shod nature of this EIS has shocked me. For example, I expected that there would be some serious analysis of alternatives but instead the same statements are repeated in different documents again and again.

Over recent decades, there has obviously been a debate among transport planners about tollways with the analysis that rejects tollways as a preferred solution growing stronger. Despite this, the AECOM EIS analysis fails to take account of these debates. Is this because it has been involved in a number of failed projections for tollways and has indeed settled a negiglence case for $200 million? This lack of critical engagement with key transport planning issues is reflected in the Response to Submissions for the M4 East where the original EIS is simply repeated back, with little engagement with critical points being raised by submitters.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

I am concerned that because the RMS is the client there is not independent critical analysis of the traffic modelling. This especially concerns me because AECOM, the company that has done the modelling, has a conflict of interest through a range of other contracts in the project. AECOM and RMS work alongside each other as partners in Westconnex. There is no sense in which AECOM has any critical distance or independence from the project. It is hard to think of a less suitable choice of company to do the EIS. In the Response to Submissions report for the M4, there is a claim that AECOM got the job through an open tender. According to my research on the Tender.nsw.gov database, it was in fact a limited tender.

I am also concerned that Westconnex Delivery Authority, now a private company Sydney Motorway Corporation employed people from private companies who appeared to be working for the Authority at the time this project was being developed. Some of these companies have interests in construction of tollways and yet are involved in governance decisions for this project. These seems to be a collapse of accountability measures that can protect the public interest.

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

The business case for this project is also not transparent because of hundreds of redactions.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy. In fact my own analysis of the data presented on congestion at intersections beyond the St Peters interchange shows that in the 2031 AM peak alone, Level of Service will be the same or worse. In other words this project is NOT a transformational project - indeed it is laughable to suggest it is.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

As I am not a traffic expert I endorse submissions by Chris Standen and suggest that his views and those of other critical experts should be very closely considered by the Planning Department as they undoubtedly will not be by the RMS or SMC or AECOM.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

In this context I am concerned about the situation in Alexandria. I cannot believe that the Planning Department would approve a road that would come within 2 metres of homes. Westconnex itself has admitted that in 2021 with the Westconnex the roads at Alexandria will not be over capacity.

A few days ago, I received this media release from the Westconnex Action Group. I reproduce it here:

SYDNEY Motorway Corporation (SMC) has admitted that the WestCONnex New M5 will cause incalculable traffic congestion unless other unplanned and largely unfunded toll road projects – including the WestCONnex M4-M5 link, the Sydney Gateway and southern extension – are built as well.

In an email sent to Ben Aveling of Alexandria Residents Action Group (ARAG), Louise Bonny of the SMC admitted only 80% of the "significant increase" in traffic they expect the New M5 will generate around the St Peters Interchange could be accommodated by the existing road network. Ms Bonny went on to explain they were relying on the other toll road projects, saying:

"...the construction of the additional road network components proposed as part of theWestConnex M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and Southern extension projects provide the additional road space and increases the ability to distribute and accommodate the predicted increase in traffic."

In the same email, Ms Bonny said that the model the SMC is using to forecast traffic flows was unable to predict what would happen if these additional toll roads are not built, because "the model does not function properly and presents results that can be misleading."

"It's quite an amazing email," said Mr Aveling. "They admit they can't model the New M5 without these extra components – the numbers are so far off the scale that their model cannot begin to predict how bad congestion will be. Even with the extra components, their model shows that this is a tunnel to a traffic jam.

"Roads Minister Duncan Gay has admitted streets in this area are 'already gridlocked'. So why is his government deliberately planning to send thousands more cars a day into this area? They're trying to force a scenario where more and more toll roads have to be built."

WestCONnex Action Group (WAG) spokesperson Pauline Lockie agreed. "It's astonishing that even the people who want to build WestCONnex now admit they're relying on building more costly toll roads to try and make the New M5 work," she said.

"Even if the funding for all these toll roads comes through – and it's a very big 'if' – the New M5 will be open for years before the M4-M5 Link and Sydney Gateway are built. And the Baird Government hasn't even set dates for building the southern extension.

"What's really staggering is that the SMC has admitted it can't even model the traffic impacts of the New M5 without these other toll roads – yet it's now seeking planning approval for the New M5 as a standalone project.

"This latest admission proves what we've said all along. WestCONnex will choke Sydney's streets with cars, and see drivers from western Sydney pay huge tolls to drive straight into inner-city traffic jams.

"It's not good enough. It's time for Premier Baird to recognise this, stop the disastrous WestCONnex toll road, and invest its $16.8 billion cost in projects that would actually solve Sydney's transport problems," said Ms Lockie.

END RELEASE

The situation that will be created in Alexandria and Enmore near Edgeware Road is causing great concern in Erskineville where I have lived for 30 years. I was told at an EIS session that traffic would be prevented from turning right onto Sydney Park Road. Experience over the years has shown that traffic congestion spills from choke points into local roads.

I asked at the EIS session why no micro modelling was being done beyond two intersections and was told by the first person that this was an instruction from RMS and the second person that this was a joint RMS, Westconnex, AECOM decision. There needs to be more extensive modelling. The Planning Department should insist on this. One of the matters that concerns me is that there is no agency that can scrutinise the traffic modelling, other than Councils. For that reason, considerable weight should be placed on the analysis of City of Sydney and Marrickville Council.

So it clear that the inner West from Haberfield to Alexandria will be a traffic mess by the early 2020s. So we are told that Stage Three of which we know almost nothing will solve all this.

Little is known about Stage three but we do know that AECOM and other companies have been doing work on it for months. Yet the public is given the barest details. No doubt there will be more nasty surprises for our own and other communities down the track.

Stage 3 of Westconnex the M4 - M5 link is cited as '2031 'full WestConnex and Southern extension' in both the M4 and M5 EIS.

From M4 East EIS it says,

"The M4–M5 Link is predicted to reduce volumes to/from the Parramatta Road and Wattle Street portals by 28 per cent and 22 per cent respectively. However, eastbound volumes exiting the Wattle Street portal are actually forecast to increase by around 12 per cent. This is partly a result of a lack of connectivity between the eastbound tunnel and the ANZAC Bridge.

Full WestConnex program of works and the Southern extension (2031): With all WestConnex projects completed, including the future M4-M5 Link and future Sydney Gateway, as well as the Southern extension. In this scenario, the future M4-M5 Link does not provide an access to the CBD north. Due to capacity constraints on the ANZAC and Harbour bridges the provision of this connection is not possible without an additional harbour crossing. At present the provision of an additional crossing is not a committed government scheme and as such neither the crossing nor the CBD north access at Rozelle has been included in the assessment."

From New M5 EIS 4.1.1.6 Modelled scenarios page 33 Vol 2B App G

"Full WestConnex program of works and the Southern extension (2031): With all WestConnex projects completed, including the future M4-M5 Link and future Sydney Gateway, as well as the Southern extension. In this scenario, the future M4-M5 Link does not provide an access to the CBD north. Due to capacity constraints on the ANZAC and Harbour bridges the provision of this connection is not possible without an additional harbour crossing. At present the provision of an additional crossing is not a committed government scheme and as such neither the crossing nor the CBD north access at Rozelle has been included in the assessment. "

I understand that during an EIS session in St Peters on Monday, 18 January 2016

and Wolli Creek on Thursday, 21 January 2016, Steven Kemp said there would be no exit from the Rozelle interchange during peak periods if at all because of the lack of capacity on Anzac Bridge.

A friend and colleague Colin Charlton received this reply to an email sent to David Kemp and Rachel Elazzi

"Dear Mr Charlton

Thank you for your email about the M4-M5 Link.

At this stage, work is underway on developing a concept design and preparing a delivery strategy for the project. Page 154 of the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case shows the indicative route of the project.

The Rozelle Interchange contains a connection at City West Link and provides for a future connection to the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link. At the time of opening, the Rozelle Interchange will allow traffic to enter the WestConnex tunnels from the Anzac Bridge. However, access from the M4–M5 Link to the Anzac Bridge will be managed to optimise traffic flow until the opening of the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link in order to effectively optimise traffic flow. Modelling indicates the Rozelle Interchange will provide effective access to the WestConnex tunnels in 2031.

Subject to planning approval being granted by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment, construction on the M4-M5 Link would to start in 2019 and be opened to traffic in 2023.

If you have any further questions, please call our project hotline on 1300 660 248 and speak to Erin Riley.

Yours sincerely

Bahar Sydney Motorway Corporation"

Victoria Road is projected to be more congested after the M4 widening and the M4 East in both other EIS reports. So exit from the tunnel would be limited at Rozelle due to the congestion in that area.

This would mean that the only exit between the Haberfield Interchange (M4) and St peters interchange (New M5) would be at Parramatta Rd Camperdown. One of the stated aims in the M4 EIS is to reduce traffic on Parramatta Rd. major traffic congestion would be expected on Parramatta Rd and Boadway especially at City Rd a major intersection outside the area of study

This shows the problem of a seperate EIS for each stage when they are so interelated restricting exit at the Rozelle Interchange and major traffic congestion on Parramatta Rd. will have an effect at St Peters and Haberfield. Motorists will make a decission to exit at St Peters and Haberfield if they can not exit at Rozelle.

This shows the fanciful planning that lies behind the positive case for Westconnex. Everytime a major flaw arises, more tunnel is added.

Nearer to home in St Peters, there is not even a design or plan for the so called Sydney Gateway which i am informed has not been contested into the $17 billion for Westconnex.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street. In this context I endorse and encourage strong attention should be paid to the submission of planner Bruce Lay. Of course if the same approach is taken as was taken by AECOM on the M4 East, it doesn't matter how serious the heritage impacts, it will not be seriously considered as an obstacle to the development.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it. No noise analysis at all is done for above two stories. What for example will be done for residents living in apartments on the corner of Barwon Park Road and Campbell Street who will face horrific construction and operational noise.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies. The fact that the NSW government is supporting several private light rail projects does not mean this is an integrated solution. It is particularly NOT a solution for the Western Suburbs that need serious public transport solutions not tolled roads.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5. I have personally visited these ponds which need to be weeded. I find it unacceptable that only one day of aquatic study was done for the biodiversity study. I recommend the submission of Grant Webster. The public needs an explanation for why his published photo of a breeding event on the golf course was not included or explored further in the EIS. The RMS appears not to have done what was necessary to have protected the Green and Golden Bellfrog. One if tempted to wonder if this was deliberate. In any case, the key consultant does not appear to be free to talk publicly about his work to protect the frogs. I also am concerned that the consultants for the biodiverity study were unable to get onto Kogorah Golf course.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.M4 - M5 exit

I strongly object to the short time that has been allowed for consideration of this EIS and the fact that it took place over the Summer period.

I have made a reportable political donation to the NSW Greens. I will be sending my form in by mail. One of the reasons I donated for the Greens was that they were the only party who were standing up for rational transport planning and supporting the community in its oppositin to the Westconnex. ..



# Political Donations Disclosure Statement to Minister or the Director-General

*If you are required under section 147(3) of the* Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 *to disclose any political donations (see Page 1 for details), please fill in this form and sign below.*

**Disclosure statement details**

| Name of person making this disclosure | Planning application reference (e.g. DA number, planning application title or reference, property address or other description) |
|---|---|
| WENDY BACON | 14 – 6788 MS. |

Your interest in the planning application (circle relevant option below)

You are the APPLICANT **YES** / (**NO**) OR You are a PERSON MAKING A SUBMISSION IN RELATION TO AN APPLICATION (**YES**) / **NO**

**Reportable political donations made by person making this declaration or by other relevant persons**

* *State below any reportable political donations* ***you have made*** *over the 'relevant period' (see glossary on page 2). If the donation was made by an entity (and not by you as an individual) include the Australian Business Number (ABN).*

* *If you are the* ***applicant*** *of a relevant planning application state below any reportable political donations that you know, or ought reasonably to know, were made by any persons with a financial interest in the planning application, OR*

* *If you are a* ***person making a submission*** *in relation to an application, state below any reportable political donations that you know, or ought reasonably to know, were made by an associate.*

| Name of donor (or ABN if an entity) | Donor's residential address or entity's registered address or other official office of the donor | Name of party or person for whose benefit the donation was made | Date donation made | Amount/ value of donation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wendy Bacon | 64 Jarvis St. Newtown 2042 | NSW Greens | 3/7/14 | 100 |
| Wendy Bacon | " | NSW Greens | 29/9/14 | 100 |
| Wendy Bacon | " | NSW Greens | 29/11/14 | 100 |
| Wendy Bacon. | " | NSW Greens. | 29/1/15 | 100 |

*Please list all reportable political donations—additional space is provided overleaf if required.*

By signing below, I/we hereby declare that all information contained within this statement is accurate at the time of signing.

Signature(s) and Date Wendy Bacon. 29/1/2016.

Name(s) WENDY BACON.

Cont

## Political Donations Disclosure Statement to Minister or the Director-General

| Name of donor (or ABN if an entity) | Donor's residential address or entity's registered address or other official office of the donor | Name of party or person for whose benefit the donation was made | Date donation made | Amount/ value of donation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wendy Bacon | 64 Gurner St. Newtown 2042 | NSW Greens | 8/12/2014 | 130 |
| Wendy Bacon | " | NSW Greens | 28/2/2015 | 100 |
| Wendy Bacon | " | NSW Greens | 29/3/2015 | 100 |
| Wendy Bacon. | " | NSW Greens | 24/3/2015 | 500 |
| Wendy Bacon | " | " | 17/2/2015 | 100 |
| Wendy Bacon | " | " | 5/1/2015 | 50 |
| Wendy Bacon. | " | " | 29/12/2015 | 100 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

[redacted]

**From:** LEIAH WOOLSTONE [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:44 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

WestConnex as proposed is the wrong solution at the wrong time for Sydney. It is out of

step with international best practice when it comes to transport policy and the creating

liveable, economically viable cities in the 21st century.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. WestConnex will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW will use. If its huge and rapidly escalating $16.8 billion cost was invested in more sustainable transport options instead, such as public transport improvements in western and south-west Sydney, better management of Sydney's existing roads, and so on it would not only be likely to reduce congestion and improve mobility in our capital. It would also free up much-needed public funds for improving roads, public transport, schools and hospitals in regional NSW. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or

omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

We recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project, particularly as contracts have already been signed for the New M5 ahead of such approval being granted. We remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

LEIAH WOOLSTONE

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Gillian Venditti [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:33 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

WestConnex as proposed is the wrong solution at the wrong time for Sydney. It is out of

step with international best practice when it comes to transport policy and the creating

liveable, economically viable cities in the 21st century.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. WestConnex will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW will use. If its huge and rapidly escalating $16.8 billion cost was invested in more sustainable transport options instead, such as public transport improvements in western and south-west Sydney, better management of Sydney's existing roads, and so on it would not only be likely to reduce congestion and improve mobility in our capital. It would also free up much-needed public funds for improving roads, public transport, schools and hospitals in regional NSW. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or

omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

We recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project, particularly as contracts have already been signed for the New M5 ahead of such approval being granted. We remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Gillian Venditti

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Karen Booth [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:32 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

WestConnex as proposed is the wrong solution at the wrong time for Sydney. It is out of

step with international best practice when it comes to transport policy and the creating

liveable, economically viable cities in the 21st century.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. WestConnex will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW will use. If its huge and rapidly escalating $16.8 billion cost was invested in more sustainable transport options instead, such as public transport improvements in western and south-west Sydney, better management of Sydney's existing roads, and so on it would not only be likely to reduce congestion and improve mobility in our capital. It would also free up much-needed public funds for improving roads, public transport, schools and hospitals in regional NSW. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or

omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

We recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project, particularly as contracts have already been signed for the New M5 ahead of such approval being granted. We remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Karen Booth

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:28 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 4:58 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 4:54 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Rebecca Hawkins [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 4:52 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Rebecca Hawkins

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Scott Simpson [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 4:52 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Scott Simpson

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 4:49 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Please make youself a cup of tea and take the time to sit down and read the following:

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will

substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport

component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Bruce Irvine [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 4:45 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Bruce Irvine

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 4:45 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.



[redacted]

**From:** Megan Bridge [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 4:45 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Megan Bridge

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Nerolie Goddard [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 4:43 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Nerolie Goddard

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** ely whyman [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 4:41 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

ely whyman

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Ellen Scott [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 12:14 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Ellen Scott

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 12:07 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Justin Bone [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 12:00 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Justin Bone

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Adan Rand [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 12:00 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Local Resident's Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788.

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

As a resident in the immediate vicinity of this project I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

The risk to green space, air quality and other environmental impacts as well as broad quality of life reduction for local residents is unacceptable for the un-costed and un-proven "benefits" this project will deliver on it's own.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and

indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Adan Rand

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Digby Duncan [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:56 AM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay

the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I ask that you work to keep traffic out of the city and provide good public transport instead of turning the city into a large car park.

Il therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Digby Duncan

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:55 AM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay

the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]



[redacted]

**From:** Jamie Nguyen [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:54 AM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jamie Nguyen

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 11:52 AM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

_____



[redacted] -

**From:** Scott Williamson [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:44 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Scott Williamson

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** cameron donald [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:39 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

cameron donald

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Ngaire Worboys [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:37 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Ngaire Worboys

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Jackie Davis [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:37 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jackie Davis

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Pam Litten [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:36 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Pam Litten

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] 11865

**From:** Jacqueline Pangas [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:34 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jacqueline Pangas

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:31 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:31 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Gabriel Knowles [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:31 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Gabriel Knowles

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:31 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Do not puplish my name in the submission.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:29 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

---

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:29 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:25 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Natalie Mortimer [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:23 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Natalie Mortimet

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:23 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Sharlene Henderson [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:23 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Research has shown this project to be fatally flawed in its design; it won't ease traffic congestion (in fact, just the opposite) and will destroy communities and the surrounding environment.

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. The cost benefit analyses all show this to be a white elephant of a project - the only ones who will benefit are the engineering and construction companies who receive the contracts.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

The money set aside for this project would be better put into sustainable solutions such as park-and-ride, public transport and creating community & corporate hubs.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and

businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Sharlene Henderson

[redacted]



[redacted]

**From:** Desley Haas [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:21 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Desley Haas

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Monica Schweickle [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:20 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Monica Schweickle

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Trudi Jenkins [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:14 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Trudi Jenkins

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Leigh Foster [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:14 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I am a resident of Erskineville who has lived within the area for the last 7 years. As a committed community memeber I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better

outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Leigh Foster

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:12 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.



[redacted]

**From:** Sadhbh Joyce [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:11 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.



[redacted]

**From:** tanya sparke [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:06 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

tanya sparke

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 3:05 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.



[redacted]

**From:** Bob Jansen [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:57 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Bob Jansen

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Emma Chapman [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:57 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Emma Chapman

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Sandra Alessio [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:54 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Sandra Alessio

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Sophie Holland [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:48 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Sophie Holland

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:47 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:43 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

This is my second submission and the reason behind it is that yesterday I was near the M5 at Rosebank Ave Kingsgrove . There is a mound separating the current M5 from the houses/ park there and it was constructed during the initial M5 extension around 2000-2001.

I understand that it will be moved for the new West Connex . It contains ASBESTOS. What are you going to do about that for the locals. The mound works very well in keeping noise down. A lot better than the proposed see through barriers.

regards

Paul

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square

metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

_____

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:43 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

_____



[redacted]

**From:** Korey Moon [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:42 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Korey Moon

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Grace McCabe [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:39 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

The future of Sydney with WestConnex will only be a bleak and over polluted city full of miserable people stuck in traffic jams. I am horrified that the government has approved such a monstrous abuse on the people of Sydney. Not only are they prepared to rip apart a beautiful park they have spent millions on developing to be an Eco powerhouse, but they considered this a solution to Sydney's problems. Western Sydney was promised economic infrastructure in the West, creating CBDs in the west. Instead, this government gives them another tunnel to be trapped in every morning and every evening as they commute to the CBD.

Our children will grow up thinking cities that serve cars is the norm. They will breathe toxic air, and play in reduced parks on the side of huge tollways with emission stacks poking high above the park, pumping deadly air into their lungs.

In a world which now experiences destructive and extreme weather events almost weekly, it is CRIMINAL to build yet another motorway and encourage the continued use of cars.

I am 20 years of age, I once saw so much potential in our city. As our population increases to 10 million in the coming years, I saw proper public transport, proper investment into green transport, communal transport, green energy and environmental care and conservation. I envisioned a city that served it's PEOPLE not cars. Investing this money in public transport and renewable energy will reward the city, state, and country for generations.

When I travel I am embarrassed by our cities pitiful excuse for public transport, and our country's absolute neglect of global environmental goals. I am not the only young adult who feels this way. I will STOP WestConnex because my views and my vision for Sydney are green.

Yours sincerely,

Grace McCabe

Sydney NSW 2043, Australia



[redacted]

**From:** Kylie Lawrence [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:37 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

Without profitable small businesses, supported by locals, you do not have a city.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Kylie Lawrence

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Doc Marshall [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:27 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Doc Marshall

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:20 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

This project is flawed. Many of the requirements set by Dept of Planning are not met by EIS. This project encourages a car dependent society, will lead to increased greenhouse emissions and destroy and damage the mobility, street life, small businesses and health of communities in inner and south west Sydney. Residents in Sydney's far western suburbs gain no public transport and those who drive are consigned to expensive tolls that will lead to traffic jams.

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails 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 to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents 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 and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.



[redacted]

**From:** Janinr Bailey [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:16 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Janinr Bailey

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Rebecca Johnston [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:16 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Tebecca Johnston

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Emily Saint-Smith [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:15 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Emily Saint-Smith

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

**From:** Peter Campbell [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, 29 January 2016 1:13 PM
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

**Categories:** Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

It also has been stated that these tolls are to be in effect for 43 years. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

I object the destruction of heritage buildings for this project. I also object to leaving other heritage buildings isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

I object to residents in south west Sydney suffering a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

I object to not modelling beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree 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 or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. 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. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, 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, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Campbell

[redacted]

[redacted]