[redacted]

From: Rosalie Viney [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:32 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Rosalie Viney

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Kath Ashe [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:29 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Kath Ashe

[redacted]

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: Reza Mokhtar [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:28 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Reza Mokhtar

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Yolanda Masterson [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:28 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Yolanda Masterson

[redacted]

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: Julia Mendel [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:26 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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 Mendel

[redacted]

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: Kendal Murray [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:26 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Kendal Murray

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Karen Marsden [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:24 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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 Marsden

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Cindy Wilkinson [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:23 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Cindy Wilkinson

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: andrea clift [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:22 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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 clift

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Shane Sutton [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:28 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Shane Sutton

[redacted]

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: Jody O'Connor [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:28 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Jody O'Connor

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Sharon Davis [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:28 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Sharon Davis

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:28 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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: Craig Blair [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:28 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Craig Blair

[redacted]

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: Christen Cornell [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:26 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Christen Cornell

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Mike Hatton [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:14 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Mike Hatton

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Tom Museth [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:00 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Tom Museth

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:33 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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: Argyrios Menis [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:25 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: My objection to: 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788)

Director Infrastructure Projects

Planning Services

NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Application Number SSI 6788

Dear Director,

I object to the 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788) for the reasons outlined below.

The WestConnex will not solve Sydney's traffic issues; the Environmental Impact Statement itself demonstrates, that even with construction of the full project, travel times in our community will only improve by as little as 30 seconds whilst, in other areas, traffic on suburban streets will increase by almost as much as 50%.

Spending $17bn of taxpayer money on an infrastructure project that is not part of an integrated transit policy is just plain irresponsible.

The EIS demonstrates that the number of vehicles that will access the WestConnex road network is significantly lower than expected due to excessive tolling. This will mean more cars on suburban streets trying to find short cuts. Streets in our community are already in effect standing carparks; they just can't take additional traffic.

The impact of the WestConnex is such that it isn't just cars and private traffic which will experience ongoing gridlock, the EIS also shows that this project will severely hamper bus services, increasing travel time by over 20% in some instances. For those people who lessen the overall traffic burden by utilising public transport, this project is a punishing concern.

The WestConnex will result in the clearing of countless homes, and will severely affect parts of the community, destroying the amenity of residents in places like Euston Road.

The placement of unfiltered smoke stacks in our community will pour dangerous pollutants into residential areas and near to schools like Alexandria Park Community School.

The EIS also does not take into account the impact of flow on traffic to areas in our community which fall outside the reports very limited area of study. Therefore this EIS has not considered the flow on impact of traffic emerging from the St Peters interchange into the suburbs of Mascot, Eastlakes, Kensington, Kingsford, Erskineville and Alexandria, not to mention other areas, such as to the inner city or to the east.

I would like the following issues in the EIS addressed:

-The negative impact this project has on public transport.

-The unfiltered smoke stacks putting our health at risk.

-The widening of Campbell Street and Euston Road.

-The acquisition and clearance of homes and businesses in our community.

-The impact of rat run traffic on our community roads caused by excessive tolling.

-The lack of adequate traffic modelling

Yours sincerely,

Argyrios Menis

Sydney NSW 2018, Australia



[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:32 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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: Clive Hogton [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:31 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Clive Hogton

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Cecile Busny [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:30 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Cecile Busny

[redacted]

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: Andy Graham [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:30 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Andy Graham

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Marg Frisk [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:30 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Marg Frisk

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Wyatt Moss-Wellington <[redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:30 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Wyatt Moss-Wellington

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Andrew Young [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:30 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Andrew Young

[redacted]

[redacted]



From: Stephanie Tam [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:29 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Stephanie Tam

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:29 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:29 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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: Matt Campora [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:29 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Matt Campora

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Cheryl L Dickson [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:29 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Cheryl L Dickson

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Lisa Moore [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:29 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Lisa Moore

[redacted]

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:29 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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: paul tratt [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:28 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

paul tratt

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:29 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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: Celeste Maddocks [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:28 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

Celeste Maddocks

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: leah gressel [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:28 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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,

leah gressel

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] [redacted]

From: [redacted] [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 11:28 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, 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.

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.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been 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 EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

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.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that 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.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

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 accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that 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 and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. 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.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. 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.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about

residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

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 analysis of alternatives to WestConnex 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 noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence 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 not reliable.

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 project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East 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.

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.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

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: Louise Gilbert [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 4:57 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters. What testing that has been done in Alexandria is limited, inconsistent and amateurish but doesindicate that many properties in Alexandria will be well above safe noise limits.

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The Minister, Mr Gay, in a recent Sydney Morning Herald interview, did not appear to know anything about these developments let alone how these 150,000 new residents will affect traffic in the area. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account. Euston Rd and McEvoy Sts, Wyndham, Botany and Mitchell Rds are already gridlocked most of the time.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now. We should not be sacrificing historic urban areas and people's health and welfare to build a 1950's solution to the art of moving large numbers of people. Las Angeles tried it and are now trying to reinstate public transport systems.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way. Alexandria already has particle pollution levels above national guidelines.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic. Will the all of the local streets-the ones I've already mentioned-be widened also? Why not just bulldoze all the house and just have roads.

When complete, the New M5 will dump thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless. Business in Alexandria will be greatly affected if parking is removed from local roads. Alexandria is becoming a vibrant and interesting retail area but this will be threatened by the proliferation of mega roads everywhere. I also object to the plan to remove the ability to turn right into Sydney Park Rd in an attempt to get people to use the toll road rather than the Princes Hwy. As a resident of Alexandria I want to use the Princes Hwy to get to local shops in St. Peter's, Marrickville Sydenham and Tempe and to visit friends in Arncliffe. I do not want to have to go half way round the world to go a fe w kilometres.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the removal of signicant sections o Syney Park to both accommodate the roads themselves and to provide a huge construction depot.

I object to the selection of tunnelling, methods, namely blasting, that may damage houses at the surface. Will the Government compensate the owners of such houses fairly or at all?

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice and I object to the unfiltered exhaust stacks whisk will pour this pollution into our homes and schools.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. This road development will carve up our suburbs and separate and isolate people and make the task of waking or cycling around our local areas impossible.The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Louise Gilbert

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 4:51 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Caroline Rodrigues [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 4:37 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Rodrigues

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Kate Macdessi [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 6:57 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Kate Macdessi

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Sarah Binley [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 6:27 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Binley

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Natalija Rusidi [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 6:25 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Natalija Rusidi

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Anthony Gee [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 6:20 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Anthony Gee

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Richard Capuano [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 5:55 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

My home is being 'acquired' by the RMS - who've been nasty toward residents and treated us with considerable disrespect, despite assuring us we'd be looked after. Liars and cheats, that's all they are.

Many of my neighbours have already been cheated out of several hundred thousand dollars (if the RMS had a backbone, they'd recompense these residents), and the rest of us have just been issued with the PAN -- the RMS will take possession of our homes on 20 April, and I'm expected to rent from them -- what a load of rubbish.

Based on their pathetic offer (I was compared to a 2br semi, I have a 4br Terrace), I'll be seriously out of pocket and there's absolutely no way I can afford to purchase a similar home in the area... the stress and uncertainty over the last year has been soul-destroying and they didn't even stick to the legislated timeframe - but they don't care. I am now effectively homeless. Thanks.

The RMS has completely corrupted the Acquisition process and want it all their way, we have to fight for compensation - at taxpayer expense, but they don't care. We already know the review has stated the process is seriously flawed, and we should be able to buy a home similar to what we already have -- not be given some crap 'market value' they make up by deliberately undervaluing our homes by comparing us to inferior houses in inferior suburbs. Heck, their valuer had no idea what value to put on homes and chose the lowest value. Seriously, what a bunch of cowboys.

Myself and other neighbours will be fighting this all the way, the RMS has bullied/cheated us enough and we're fed up with them.

The WDA also put our health at risk by removing asbestos contaminated waste from the Alexandria Landfill past our homes (I wrote to the Dept Planning but you wouldn't get involved, and EPA let them do whatever they want).

WDA and Marrickville Council hid behind existing 'clean up' notices for the site, and commenced 'preparatory work' without proper approvals. Phillip Neville from EPA and Jack McGovern from WDA (two-faced liars) wouldn't even listen to our request to use the Burrows Rd entry away from residents (apparently because of the location of the wheel wash at Albert St, yet trucks were filthy) - we documented trucks spreading asbestos contaminated dirt throughout the residential area on Campbell St/Rd.

If we are to get some illness related to asbestos exposure, I seriously doubt the State Govt will help us and WDA will be gone... they're bullies and cowards, how dare they deliberately put our health at risk.

When we tried to call for a halt to work, WDA called Newtown Police (who witnessed the dust storms and dirty trucks, yet did nothing) and Insp Astley read us the riot act while WDA staff stood behind them and laughed at us. Bullies.

Even Duncan Gay called us 'Nasty Little Anarchists' in parliament, how disrespectful after putting our health at risk... how dare this government think they can just walk all over us.

Since returning to work from Xmas/New Year holidays, WDA has removed the safety fence and started to rip up concrete near the entrance (I was expected to put up with loud jack hammering 10hrs/day) - this work goes far beyond the 'clean up' notices.

I had to yell at them to halt work... Phillip Nevill told me they were operating under the Marrickville Council DA for the site (rubbish) while Jack McGovern pulled out some obscure clause from Environment blah blah blah 2007 to justify that the RMS 'doesn't need approval when it comes to preparing for roads'... corrupt liars, yet they won't be sacked.

You can also make out the alignment of proposed roads on the site, all of this so-called 'preparatory work' should've been approved by Dept Planning under the EIS... why has the government corrupted the approval process?

We get it, you'll just rubber stamp this dumb project and continue to walk all over residents. Thanks for crapping all over us.

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or

will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Capuano

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Fiona Scotece [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 5:51 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Fiona Scotece

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Kate Baxter [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 5:41 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Kate Baxter



From: Gregory Churm <[redacted]>
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 5:19 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem. You only have to look at the original M5. Cars and trucks came from nowhere to fill it up. Same will happen to this proposal.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Gregory Churm

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Richard Adams [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 4:30 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Adams

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Tom Petrovski [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 4:17 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Petrovski

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Maree Beveridge [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 4:04 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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

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

I write to voice my strong objections to the removal of an overwhelming high number of large, significant and historic trees to make way for this project, and ask that you reject this proposal or re-route it.

Whilst I live just out of Sydney now, I grew up there and still visit regularly, and know these trees well.

To state that you will replant, whilst commendable in some respects, is no consolation whatsoever for the removal of these long-growing trees. Loss of habitat, loss of shade, street-scape, their softening of the urban landscape, human amenity, as well as the negative environmental impacts the removal of such trees would ensure, make this project and the plan to remove so many trees puzzling, short sighted and downright outrageous.

Please, for the sake of common sense and for future Australians, please cease plans immediately for the removal of these beautiful trees and, if the project is to go ahead at all (there are other concerns however this letter pertains to the trees)..

Yours sincerely,
Maree Beveridge
New South Wales 2259, Australia

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Jeremy Scott [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 3:42 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Jeremy Scott

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 3:26 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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

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

Please don't let cars eat Sydney! Take a longer term, environmentally sustainable view of Sydney's transport needs - consider these along with our need for good health, quiet, fresh air, local community connections ...

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment

in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil

including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.



[redacted]

From: Matt Clifford [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 3:04 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Matt Clifford

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 3:02 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

_____

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Neil Ross [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 2:46 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

This project will remove and severely fragment the last stand of the threatened Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest found on the Wolli Creek system. The biodiversity offset does not maintain or improve the biodiversity values of this endangered ecological community in the local area while the clearing of this bushland erodes the existing stock of the threatened ecological community. The loss of this urban bushland will detract from the amenity in the surrounding suburb in which bushland is a rare occurrence and enjoyed by the local residents. Removal of this patch of bushland will further isolate and fragment the adjacent patches of threatened Sydney Turpentine Iron Bark Forest on Tallawalla St and Rosebank Ave contributing to their long term degradation.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Neil Ross

Sydney NSW 2208, Australia



[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 2:36 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

_____



[redacted]

From: William Laws [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 2:16 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

William Laws

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Emma Coorey [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 9:30 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 am a local resident, living in Camperdown. While I have concerns for the area that I live in due to the proposed tunnelling below Camperdown, I am most concerned and upset by the impact the plan will have, and is already having, on the St Peters/Tempe area and residents. The lack of local consultation and independent research on the impact on the environment, residents, parking, transport and local businesses is alarming to say the least.

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil

including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Emma Coorey

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Danielle Batha [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 7:28 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Danielle Batha

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Fred Coad [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 7:23 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Fred Coad

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Kat Costigan [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 6:57 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 Tempe and our suburb will be devastated by this project. Friends who live on the opposite side of the Princes Highway face the uncertainty of a tunnel, and the associated noise and vibration, being drilled underneath their home. My street and others across the Highway face gridlock as people attempt to avoid the tollway. We will be heavily impacted by increased traffic, Gannon Street and Unwins Bridge Road are already beyond capacity. The heavily redacted WestConnex business case admits that drivers will avoid the new tolls by rat running through surrounding residential streets. The extra traffic will also worsen local air quality. Suburbs such as Tempe, Enmore, Newtown, St Peters and Sydenham will be heavily impacted by increased traffic.

There are huge congestion and pollution fears, and I believe you should reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

There is no value for money for taxpayers, instead just dodgy figures to justify the huge cost blowout. Much crucial information on estimated toll revenue and operational costs has been redacted in the WestConnex business case. An examination of the stated economic benefits for WestConnex shows these have been pumped up using dubious methodologies, to try to get a positive Benefit-Cost Ratio.

The Government figures do not stack up, this is not good policy or economics for taxpayers of NSW and road users right across Sydney's tollway network. The $17 billion and counting would be much better spent on public transport and real transport solutions for Sydney.

The business case also confirms what inner west councils have been saying for months: it will lead to further congestion on Anzac bridge, Parramatta Road at Broadway and Concord Road, to name a few. Leichhardt council believes it will have a huge impact of many local streets, including Marion, Catherine, Young and Johnston streets plus Balmain Road.

Sydney City Council asked SGS Economics & Planning to review the project because the State Government has not provided details on traffic modelling and is shockingly negotiating contracts before finishing environmental assessment.

The SGS report shows WestConnex will not only have serious impacts on the inner city, it will not even meet Western Sydney's needs.

The NSW Auditor-General has also criticised WestConnex for conflicts of interest, a poor business case and lack of information to assess if the project is economically viable.

On top of this, that the NSW Government is trying to prevent GIPA requests for information from the Sydney Motorway Corporation is incredibly disappointing and is a sad indictment on accountability and transparency of good government practice.

Sydney Park

I also strongly oppose the WestConnex New M5 St Peters Interchange, it is a disgraceful spaghetti-like configuration that would look better suited to Los Angeles, than Sydney.

The latest tactic - to grab a chunk of Sydney Park - must be stopped at all costs. This is a disgraceful decision yet again not publicly released or openly discussed in the community, but revealed in the Sydney Morning Herald.

The new areas to be acquired for the motorway, which the council says will result in the loss of 350 trees, amount to about 6000 square metres of land. That is in addition to the 8000 square metres already reserved for wider roads. This is a huge environmental impact on the landscape.

This is not acceptable considering the environmental damage it is already wreaking with the proposal to remove critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove, and 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.

The 41.6-hectare Sydney Park has been subject to significant remediation and landscaping, an effort that has won it a Green Flag, an international award for parks. To say some of this land will be returned to the community as parkland once the motorway is built - well in what condition will it be and the Park will then have a view of the flyover from half its footprint, plus the unwelcome intrusion of the noise and pollution and smoke stacks. Let alone the extra traffic on Campbell and Euston streets in nearby Alexandria which will change the very essence of Sydney Park and its essential green space for thousands of inner west residents and interstate and international visitors.

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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. Many nurses live in my area of Tempe and work night shifts and public holidays and can not rely on public transport to get to Randwick, Maroubra and other eastern suburbs areas. This motorway will make their life even harder with a longer commute in more congested areas.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two storeys, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic, and the stress and uncertainty of residents whose homes are being compulsorily acquired throughout the affected areas and who have not been dealt with in a fair and transparent manner.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities, including mine at Tempe, will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be

destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading to say the very least considering the scope and expense of this project.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process. The NSW Government can not argue it has a mandate for this project when it consistently and surreptiously changes the goalposts and continues to obscure information that should be publicly available.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Kat Costigan

[redacted]

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: Richard Capuano [redacted]>
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 7:55 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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

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

I very 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).

My home is being 'acquired' by the RMS who've been nasty toward residents and treated us with considerable disrespect, despite assuring us we'd be looked after. Liars and cheats, that's all they are.

Many of my neighbours have already been cheated out of several hundred thousand dollars (if the RMS had a backbone, they'd recompense these residents), and the rest of us have just been issued with the PAN meaning the RMS will take possession of our homes on 20 April, and I'm expected to rent from them. What a load of rubbish, we were informed by WDA that we would not to be out of pocket.

Based on their pathetic offer (I was compared to a 2br semi, I have a 4br Terrace), I'll be seriously out of pocket and there's absolutely no way I can afford to purchase a similar home in the area... the stress and uncertainty over the last year has been soul-destroying and they didn't even stick to the legislated timeframe, but they don't care. I am now effectively homeless. Thanks.

The RMS has completely corrupted the Acquisition process and want it all their way, we have to fight for compensation - at taxpayer expense, but they don't care. We already know the review has stated the process is seriously flawed, and we should be able to buy a home similar to what we already have, not be given some crap 'market value' they make up by deliberately undervaluing our homes by comparing us to inferior houses in inferior suburbs. Heck, their valuer had no idea what value to put on homes and chose the lowest value. Seriously, what a bunch of cowboys.

Myself and other neighbours will be fighting this all the way, the RMS has bullied/cheated us enough and we're fed up with them.

The WDA also put our health at risk by removing asbestos contaminated waste from the Alexandria Landfill past our homes (I wrote to the Dept Planning but you wouldn't get involved, and EPA let them do whatever they want).

WDA and Marrickville Council hid behind existing 'clean up' notices for the site, and commenced 'preparatory work' without proper approvals. Phillip Neville from EPA and Jack McGovern from WDA (two-faced liars) wouldn't even listen to our request to use the Burrows Rd entry away from residents (apparently because of the location of the wheel wash at Albert St, yet trucks were filthy) and we documented trucks spreading asbestos contaminated dirt throughout the residential area on Campbell St/Rd.

If we are to get some illness related to asbestos exposure, I seriously doubt the State Govt will help us and WDA will be gone. They're nasty bullies and cowards, how dare they deliberately put our health at risk.

When we tried to call for a halt to work, WDA called Newtown Police (who witnessed the dust storms and dirty trucks, yet did nothing) and Insp Astley read us the riot act while WDA staff stood behind them and laughed at us. Bullies.

Even Duncan Gay called us 'Nasty Little Anarchists' in parliament, how disrespectful after putting our health at risk... how dare this government think they can just walk all over us.

Since returning to work from Xmas/New Year holidays, WDA has removed the safety fence and started to rip up concrete near the entrance (I was expected to put up with loud jack hammering 10hrs/day) this work goes far beyond the 'clean up' notices and they know it.

I had to yell at them to halt work. Phillip Nevill told me they were operating under the Marrickville Council DA for the site (rubbish) while Jack McGovern pulled out some obscure clause from Environment blah blah blah 2007 to justify that the RMS 'doesn't need approval when it comes to preparing for roads'. Corrupt liars, yet they won't be sacked.

You can also make out the alignment of proposed roads on the site, all of this so-called 'preparatory work' should've been approved by Dept Planning under the EIS. Why has the government corrupted the approval process?

We get it, you'll just rubber stamp this dumb project and continue to walk all over residents. Thanks for crapping all over us.My home is being 'acquired' by the RMS - who've been nasty toward residents and treated us with considerable disrespect, despite assuring us we'd be looked after. Liars and cheats, that's all they are.

Many of my neighbours have already been cheated out of several hundred thousand dollars (if the RMS had a backbone, they'd recompense these residents), and the rest of us have just been issued with the PAN -- the RMS will take possession of our homes on 20 April, and I'm expected to rent from them -- what a load of rubbish.

Based on their pathetic offer (I was compared to a 2br semi, I have a 4br Terrace), I'll be seriously out of pocket and there's absolutely no way I can afford to purchase a similar home in the area... the stress and uncertainty over the last year has been soul-destroying and they didn't even stick to the legislated timeframe - but they don't care. I am now effectively homeless. Thanks.

The RMS has completely corrupted the Acquisition process and want it all their way, we have to fight for compensation - at taxpayer expense, but they don't care. We already know the review has stated the process is seriously flawed, and we should be able to buy a home similar to what we already have -- not be given some crap 'market value' they make up by deliberately undervaluing our homes by comparing us to inferior houses in inferior suburbs. Heck, their valuer had no idea what value to put on homes and chose the lowest value. Seriously, what a bunch of cowboys.

Myself and other neighbours will be fighting this all the way, the RMS has bullied/cheated us enough and we're fed up with them.

The WDA also put our health at risk by removing asbestos contaminated waste from the Alexandria Landfill past our homes (I wrote to the Dept Planning but you wouldn't get involved, and EPA let them do whatever they want).

WDA and Marrickville Council hid behind existing 'clean up' notices for the site, and commenced 'preparatory work' without proper approvals. Phillip Neville from EPA and Jack McGovern from WDA (two-faced liars) wouldn't even listen to our request to use the Burrows Rd entry away from residents (apparently because of the location of the wheel wash at Albert St, yet trucks were filthy) - we documented trucks spreading asbestos contaminated dirt throughout the residential area on Campbell St/Rd.

If we are to get some illness related to asbestos exposure, I seriously doubt the State Govt will help us and WDA will be gone... they're bullies and cowards, how dare they deliberately put our health at risk.

When we tried to call for a halt to work, WDA called Newtown Police (who witnessed the dust storms and dirty trucks, yet did nothing) and Insp Astley read us the riot act while WDA staff stood behind them and laughed at us. Bullies.

Even Duncan Gay called us 'Nasty Little Anarchists' in parliament, how disrespectful after putting our health at risk... how dare this government think they can just walk all over us.

Since returning to work from Xmas/New Year holidays, WDA has removed the safety fence and started to rip up concrete near the entrance (I was expected to put up with loud jack hammering 10hrs/day) - this work goes far beyond the 'clean up' notices.

I had to yell at them to halt work... Phillip Nevill told me they were operating under the Marrickville Council DA for the site (rubbish) while Jack McGovern pulled out some obscure clause from Environment blah blah blah 2007 to justify that the RMS 'doesn't need approval when it comes to preparing for roads'... corrupt liars, yet they won't be sacked.

You can also make out the alignment of proposed roads on the site, all of this so-called 'preparatory work' should've been approved by Dept Planning under the EIS... why has the government corrupted the approval process?

We get it, you'll just rubber stamp this dumb project and continue to walk all over residents. Thanks for crapping all over us.

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Capuano

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: Zoran Lozevski [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 7:33 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Zoran Lozevski

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Stuart Fox [redacted]>
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 7:32 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Stuart Fox

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Georgina Briers [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 2:31 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 also strongly object to the plan to build unfiltered polluting stacks and tunnels in areas where toxins will be exhausted into highly populated areas. National air quality goals will be exceeded and the polluted air will impact on the health of those living and working near the tunnels. These will include school children and the elderly in facilities close to the stacks. I am appalled that the dangerous fine particles will not be registered by the monitoring stations installed to register air quality goal exceedences.

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would take place. 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.

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.

I strongly object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away, and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should have been extended until March 2016.

A whole community at St Peters will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

The arrogant EIS social impact study dismisses the impact of the compulsory acquisitons that are forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses and fracturing long-standing communities in a few lines. This is unacceptable, 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.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presened evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms. Some of these roads will be less than 5m from people's homes, which is unacceptable.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims, rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Georgina Briers

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: Jon Edwards [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 2:33 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would take place. 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.

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.

I strongly object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away, and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should have been extended until March 2016.

A whole community at St Peters will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

The arrogant EIS social impact study dismisses the impact of the compulsory acquisitons that are forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses and fracturing long-standing communities in a few lines. This is unacceptable, 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.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presened evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms. Some of these roads will be less than 5m from people's homes, which is unacceptable.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims, rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Jon Edwards

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Matthew Doherty [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 2:34 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 the inadequate environmental impact statement (EIS).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

One thing that I object to in particular is the shameless creation of "facts on the ground" through the initial M4 & M5 widening works, currently nearing completion. It would seem that the project's proponents, unsure of their ability to win support on the basis of this flawed EIS, nevertheless seek to win support by ramping up the congestion on the existing freeways and thus creating a large constituency who want the government to "do something, anything!" to apparently fix their all-too-apparent woes. This sails very close to the wind of being explicitly corrupt; on any view the process has been tinged with corruption due to this transparently conniving tactic of the state govt and its predecessors.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

I 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.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would take place. This includes communities right across Sydney. 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.

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.

I strongly object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away, and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should have been extended until March 2016.

A whole community at St Peters will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

The arrogant EIS social impact study dismisses the impact of the compulsory acquisitons that are forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses and fracturing long-standing communities in a few lines. This is unacceptable, 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.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presened evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms. Some of these roads will be less than 5m from people's homes, which is unacceptable.

This project could, conceivably work on some other planet; a planet where the cars stay on the roads forever and do not need to exit the system; the need for evermore multilevel carparks flowing from this project is just one problem that has been overlooked.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims, rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

I object to the failure to consider alternatives such as expanded park-and-ride facilities at Kingsgrove (for M5 users) and Olympic Park (M4).

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew Doherty

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: David George [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 2:37 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would take place. 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.

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.

I strongly object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away, and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should have been extended until March 2016.

A whole community at St Peters will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

The arrogant EIS social impact study dismisses the impact of the compulsory acquisitons that are forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses and fracturing long-standing communities in a few lines. This is unacceptable, 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.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presened evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms. Some of these roads will be less than 5m from people's homes, which is unacceptable.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims, rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

David George

[redacted]

[redacted]



[redacted]

From: Maria Contogiannis [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 2:17 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: My objection to: 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788)

Director Infrastructure Projects

Planning Services

NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Application Number SSI 6788

Dear Director,

I object to the 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788) for the reasons outlined below.

The WestConnex will not solve Sydney's traffic issues; the Environmental Impact Statement itself demonstrates, that even with construction of the full project, travel times in our community will only improve by as little as 30 seconds whilst, in other areas, traffic on suburban streets will increase by almost as much as 50%.

Spending $17bn of taxpayer money on an infrastructure project that is not part of an integrated transit policy is just plain irresponsible.

The EIS demonstrates that the number of vehicles that will access the WestConnex road network is significantly lower than expected due to excessive tolling. This will mean more cars on suburban streets trying to find short cuts. Streets in our community are already in effect standing carparks; they just can't take additional traffic.

The impact of the WestConnex is such that it isn't just cars and private traffic which will experience ongoing gridlock, the EIS also shows that this project will severely hamper bus services, increasing travel time by over 20% in some instances. For those people who lessen the overall traffic burden by utilising public transport, this project is a punishing concern.

The WestConnex will result in the clearing of countless homes, and will severely affect parts of the community, destroying the amenity of residents in places like Euston Road.

The placement of unfiltered smoke stacks in our community will pour dangerous pollutants into residential areas and near to schools like Alexandria Park Community School.

The EIS also does not take into account the impact of flow on traffic to areas in our community which fall outside the reports very limited area of study. Therefore this EIS has not considered the flow on impact of traffic emerging from the St Peters interchange into the suburbs of Mascot, Eastlakes, Kensington, Kingsford, Erskineville and Alexandria, not to mention other areas, such as to the inner city or to the east.

I would like the following issues in the EIS addressed:

-The negative impact this project has on public transport.

-The unfiltered smoke stacks putting our health at risk.

-The widening of Campbell Street and Euston Road.

-The acquisition and clearance of homes and businesses in our community.

-The impact of rat run traffic on our community roads caused by excessive tolling.

-The lack of adequate traffic modelling

Yours sincerely,

Maria Contogiannis

New South Wales 2020, Australia

[redacted]

From: Darryn O'Brien [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 2:13 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: My objection to: 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788)

Director Infrastructure Projects

Planning Services

NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Application Number SSI 6788

Dear Director,

I object to the 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788) for the reasons outlined below.

The WestConnex will not solve Sydney's traffic issues; the Environmental Impact Statement itself demonstrates, that even with construction of the full project, travel times in our community will only improve by as little as 30 seconds whilst, in other areas, traffic on suburban streets will increase by almost as much as 50%.

Spending $17bn of taxpayer money on an infrastructure project that is not part of an integrated transit policy is just plain irresponsible.

The EIS demonstrates that the number of vehicles that will access the WestConnex road network is significantly lower than expected due to excessive tolling. This will mean more cars on suburban streets trying to find short cuts. Streets in our community are already in effect standing carparks; they just can't take additional traffic.

The impact of the WestConnex is such that it isn't just cars and private traffic which will experience ongoing gridlock, the EIS also shows that this project will severely hamper bus services, increasing travel time by over 20% in some instances. For those people who lessen the overall traffic burden by utilising public transport, this project is a punishing concern.

The WestConnex will result in the clearing of countless homes, and will severely affect parts of the community, destroying the amenity of residents in places like Euston Road.

The placement of unfiltered smoke stacks in our community will pour dangerous pollutants into residential areas and near to schools like Alexandria Park Community School.

The EIS also does not take into account the impact of flow on traffic to areas in our community which fall outside the reports very limited area of study. Therefore this EIS has not considered the flow on impact of traffic emerging from the St Peters interchange into the suburbs of Mascot, Eastlakes, Kensington, Kingsford, Erskineville and Alexandria, not to mention other areas, such as to the inner city or to the east.

I would like the following issues in the EIS addressed:

-The negative impact this project has on public transport.

-The unfiltered smoke stacks putting our health at risk.

-The widening of Campbell Street and Euston Road.

-The acquisition and clearance of homes and businesses in our community.

-The impact of rat run traffic on our community roads caused by excessive tolling.

-The lack of adequate traffic modelling

Yours sincerely,

Darryn O'Brien

New South Wales 2020, Australia

[redacted]

From: Steve Contogiannis [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 2:13 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: My objection to: 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788)

Director Infrastructure Projects

Planning Services

NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Application Number SSI 6788

Dear Director,

I object to the 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788) for the reasons outlined below.

The WestConnex will not solve Sydney's traffic issues; the Environmental Impact Statement itself demonstrates, that even with construction of the full project, travel times in our community will only improve by as little as 30 seconds whilst, in other areas, traffic on suburban streets will increase by almost as much as 50%.

Spending $17bn of taxpayer money on an infrastructure project that is not part of an integrated transit policy is just plain irresponsible.

The EIS demonstrates that the number of vehicles that will access the WestConnex road network is significantly lower than expected due to excessive tolling. This will mean more cars on suburban streets trying to find short cuts. Streets in our community are already in effect standing carparks; they just can't take additional traffic.

The impact of the WestConnex is such that it isn't just cars and private traffic which will experience ongoing gridlock, the EIS also shows that this project will severely hamper bus services, increasing travel time by over 20% in some instances. For those people who lessen the overall traffic burden by utilising public transport, this project is a punishing concern.

The WestConnex will result in the clearing of countless homes, and will severely affect parts of the community, destroying the amenity of residents in places like Euston Road.

The placement of unfiltered smoke stacks in our community will pour dangerous pollutants into residential areas and near to schools like Alexandria Park Community School.

The EIS also does not take into account the impact of flow on traffic to areas in our community which fall outside the reports very limited area of study. Therefore this EIS has not considered the flow on impact of traffic emerging from the St Peters interchange into the suburbs of Mascot, Eastlakes, Kensington, Kingsford, Erskineville and Alexandria, not to mention other areas, such as to the inner city or to the east.

I would like the following issues in the EIS addressed:

-The negative impact this project has on public transport.

-The unfiltered smoke stacks putting our health at risk.

-The widening of Campbell Street and Euston Road.

-The acquisition and clearance of homes and businesses in our community.

-The impact of rat run traffic on our community roads caused by excessive tolling.

-The lack of adequate traffic modelling

Yours sincerely,

Steve Contogiannis

New South Wales 2020, Australia

[redacted]

From: Justin McCann [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 2:11 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: My objection to: 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788)

Director Infrastructure Projects

Planning Services

NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Application Number SSI 6788

Dear Director,

I object to the 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788) for the reasons outlined below.

The WestConnex will not solve Sydney's traffic issues; the Environmental Impact Statement itself demonstrates, that even with construction of the full project, travel times in our community will only improve by as little as 30 seconds whilst, in other areas, traffic on suburban streets will increase by almost as much as 50%.

Spending $17bn of taxpayer money on an infrastructure project that is not part of an integrated transit policy is just plain irresponsible.

The EIS demonstrates that the number of vehicles that will access the WestConnex road network is significantly lower than expected due to excessive tolling. This will mean more cars on suburban streets trying to find short cuts. Streets in our community are already in effect standing carparks; they just can't take additional traffic.

The impact of the WestConnex is such that it isn't just cars and private traffic which will experience ongoing gridlock, the EIS also shows that this project will severely hamper bus services, increasing travel time by over 20% in some instances. For those people who lessen the overall traffic burden by utilising public transport, this project is a punishing concern.

The WestConnex will result in the clearing of countless homes, and will severely affect parts of the community, destroying the amenity of residents in places like Euston Road.

The placement of unfiltered smoke stacks in our community will pour dangerous pollutants into residential areas and near to schools like Alexandria Park Community School.

The EIS also does not take into account the impact of flow on traffic to areas in our community which fall outside the reports very limited area of study. Therefore this EIS has not considered the flow on impact of traffic emerging from the St Peters interchange into the suburbs of Mascot, Eastlakes, Kensington, Kingsford, Erskineville and Alexandria, not to mention other areas, such as to the inner city or to the east.

I would like the following issues in the EIS addressed:

-The negative impact this project has on public transport.

-The unfiltered smoke stacks putting our health at risk.

-The widening of Campbell Street and Euston Road.

-The acquisition and clearance of homes and businesses in our community.

-The impact of rat run traffic on our community roads caused by excessive tolling.

-The lack of adequate traffic modelling

Yours sincerely,

Justin McCann

Sydney NSW 2015, Australia

[redacted]

From: Liane Wardy <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 1:58 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: My objection to: 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788)

Director Infrastructure Projects

Planning Services

NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Application Number SSI 6788

Dear Director,

I object to the 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788) for the reasons outlined below.

The WestConnex will not solve Sydney's traffic issues; the Environmental Impact Statement itself demonstrates, that even with construction of the full project, travel times in our community will only improve by as little as 30 seconds whilst, in other areas, traffic on suburban streets will increase by almost as much as 50%.

Spending $17bn of taxpayer money on an infrastructure project that is not part of an integrated transit policy is just plain irresponsible.

The EIS demonstrates that the number of vehicles that will access the WestConnex road network is significantly lower than expected due to excessive tolling. This will mean more cars on suburban streets trying to find short cuts. Streets in our community are already in effect standing carparks; they just can't take additional traffic.

The impact of the WestConnex is such that it isn't just cars and private traffic which will experience ongoing gridlock, the EIS also shows that this project will severely hamper bus services, increasing travel time by over 20% in some instances. For those people who lessen the overall traffic burden by utilising public transport, this project is a punishing concern.

The WestConnex will result in the clearing of countless homes, and will severely affect parts of the community, destroying the amenity of residents in places like Euston Road.

The placement of unfiltered smoke stacks in our community will pour dangerous pollutants into residential areas and near to schools like Alexandria Park Community School.

The EIS also does not take into account the impact of flow on traffic to areas in our community which fall outside the reports very limited area of study. Therefore this EIS has not considered the flow on impact of traffic emerging from the St Peters interchange into the suburbs of Mascot, Eastlakes, Kensington, Kingsford, Erskineville and Alexandria, not to mention other areas, such as to the inner city or to the east.

I would like the following issues in the EIS addressed:

-The negative impact this project has on public transport.

-The unfiltered smoke stacks putting our health at risk.

-The widening of Campbell Street and Euston Road.

-The acquisition and clearance of homes and businesses in our community.

-The impact of rat run traffic on our community roads caused by excessive tolling.

-The lack of adequate traffic modelling

Yours sincerely,

Liane Wardy

New South Wales 2020, Australia

[redacted]

From: Mario Costa [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 2:28 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: My objection to: 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788)

Director Infrastructure Projects

Planning Services

NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Application Number SSI 6788

Dear Director,

I object to the 'WestConnex New M5' (SSI 6788) for the reasons outlined below.

The WestConnex will not solve Sydney's traffic issues; the Environmental Impact Statement itself demonstrates, that even with construction of the full project, travel times in our community will only improve by as little as 30 seconds whilst, in other areas, traffic on suburban streets will increase by almost as much as 50%.

Spending $17bn of taxpayer money on an infrastructure project that is not part of an integrated transit policy is just plain irresponsible.

The EIS demonstrates that the number of vehicles that will access the WestConnex road network is significantly lower than expected due to excessive tolling. This will mean more cars on suburban streets trying to find short cuts. Streets in our community are already in effect standing carparks; they just can't take additional traffic.

The impact of the WestConnex is such that it isn't just cars and private traffic which will experience ongoing gridlock, the EIS also shows that this project will severely hamper bus services, increasing travel time by over 20% in some instances. For those people who lessen the overall traffic burden by utilising public transport, this project is a punishing concern.

The WestConnex will result in the clearing of countless homes, and will severely affect parts of the community, destroying the amenity of residents in places like Euston Road.

The placement of unfiltered smoke stacks in our community will pour dangerous pollutants into residential areas and near to schools like Alexandria Park Community School.

The EIS also does not take into account the impact of flow on traffic to areas in our community which fall outside the reports very limited area of study. Therefore this EIS has not considered the flow on impact of traffic emerging from the St Peters interchange into the suburbs of Mascot, Eastlakes, Kensington, Kingsford, Erskineville and Alexandria, not to mention other areas, such as to the inner city or to the east.

I would like the following issues in the EIS addressed:

-The negative impact this project has on public transport.

-The unfiltered smoke stacks putting our health at risk.

-The widening of Campbell Street and Euston Road.

-The acquisition and clearance of homes and businesses in our community.

-The impact of rat run traffic on our community roads caused by excessive tolling.

-The lack of adequate traffic modelling

Yours sincerely,

Mario Costa

New South Wales 2020, Australia

[redacted]

From: Max Gatti [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 10:19 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Max Gatti

Sydney NSW 2040, Australia



[redacted]

From: Megan O'Connell [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 9:26 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Megan O'Connell

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Gehan Sawires [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 9:19 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Gehan Sawires

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Matthew Simpkins [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 9:09 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex, though especially with the direct affects it has on my specific property and family of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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. With my current area we will see the Wolli Creek region destroyed, yet again by a form of unsustainable infrastructure

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst and means that many items in terms of works details are easily swept under the rug. With a continual growth of our area over the last 15 years, including railway and roadways. This has meant a continual strain/fatigue on the affects such works have on my family.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless, which is a strong outrage for myself considering I spend my professional career trying to ensure my commercial developments meet such conditions. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections. This project needs to go through this detailed design and analysis process to not only ensure it is beneficial for our city, but also allows the existing community to inhabit its surroundings.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew Simpkins

Sydney NSW 2208, Australia



[redacted]

From: Kristine Coutts [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 9:00 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Kristine Coutts

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Ruth Paillas [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 8:58 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Ruth Paillas

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 8:27 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Robyn Sherrie [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 8:18 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Robyn Sherrie



[redacted]

From: Moira Bishop [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2016 8:04 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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.

This project will result in residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections they need, or investment in their regional centres 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.

This project will lock Sydney into greater reliance on inefficient and unsustainable road freight instead of investing in freight on rail alternatives. It also ignores the development of regional freight hubs in Sydney's west that would reduce the need for this project.

WestConnex is now being built by a private company that does not even have to publish its contracts. This is unaccountable government at its worst.

There has been no noise assessment for any buildings above two stories, despite the fact thousands of residents are already living in apartment blocks in Alexandria and St Peters

The proponent will not release the full assumptions on which its traffic modelling is based so that Councils and independent experts can test its predictions. This has implications for other key parts of the EIS that rely on these traffic figures, including the air quality, social and economic impact, and more.

The health affects of high levels of noise on local roads over a three year construction period have not been sufficiently assessed.

This EIS admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community can not accept this when the proponent itself (via its contractors) has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal, and has also failed to ensure this waste has been watered down at its destination sites in western Sydney.

It is not clear whether massive proposed increases in population in inner and south-west Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions. The entire area along the project footprint will be subject to massive increases in density over the next few years. There is no indication that this EIS has taken any of this into account.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks. However, this EIS does not outline what mitigation plans would be put in place for affected residents.

The business case that was finally released by the government has so many redactions that it can not be interpreted by independent analysts. It should go without saying that a project costing almost $17 billion, much of it funded by taxpayers, should be transparent.

I support a massive injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unaffordable tolls. If $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a toll road project like WestConnex be even less necessary than it is now.

There is NO safe level of fine particle exposure. Through this project and the entire WestConnex of which it is part, the NSW Government is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution in parts of the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is not acceptable for a government to jeopardise the health and safety of its citizens in this way.

The positive case for the full WestConnex rests on a pie in the sky plans that are not funded or designed. What will happen if these plans never come to fruition? The probability that these extra projects will either never be built or will remain unbuilt for many years to come is a very real one, yet this EIS fails to consider the impact of this on the areas surrounding the New M5, which would be left to cope with a crippling amount of traffic.

When complete, the New M5 will dump over thousands of extra cars into suburbs along the route, much of which will end up on local streets. This is not by accident – it is intentional. It is outrageous that Euston Road in Alexandria alone will be expected to handle 60,000 cars or ten times more than it does now. I reject the idea that a busy, polluted road should be widened to within several metres of existing homes, including children's bedrooms.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the WestConnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. In many cases the modelling does not go further than 2 intersections past the end of the project, even in instances where 10 times the current number of cars are expected to flow onto roads past that point. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from Westconnex.

I object to the failure of the EIS to consult with business owners and managers in King St Newtown and other parts of inner and south-west Sydney. These businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways or further widen roads are worthless.

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

Thousands of diesel trucks will carry spoil at all times, including peak times, leading to great disruption of local and regional road networks. I object to thousands of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste through south-west and inner Sydney roads to the western suburbs, where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

There is already insufficient parking in the inner west. I object to hundreds of parking spaces being removed, some permanently and some for several years of construction.

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

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.

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of January 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

I object to a planning system that awards billion dollar contracts to tollway construction companies when local government staff and many experts are convinced that WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

Whole communities along the route will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study – which is even less detailed than the substandard one done for the WestConnex M4 East – should be rejected, as it ignores well-established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut-and-paste job and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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 you to reject this proposal, publish this submission, and provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Moira Bishop

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Paula Houghton [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 10:09 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Paula Houghton

Sydney NSW 2213, Australia



[redacted]

From: Clarita Derwent <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 10:08 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Clarita Derwent

Sydney NSW 2042, Australia



[redacted]

From: Jacqui Pyke [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 10:03 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 Earlwood and currently we already have the Turrella stack on the east of our suburb, and now we will have the Kingsgrove stack in the west of our suburb. This is unhealthy for our children. I have been to the information days and spoken to your Tunnel Extraction person. Either way there is still going to be filthy fumes going up into that stack that will be dispersed over a highly populated area.

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Jacqui Pyke

Earlwood NSW 2206, Australia



[redacted]

From: Alistair Wallis [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 9:51 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Alistair Wallis

Sydney NSW 2040, Australia



[redacted]

From: Siobhan Costigan [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 9:48 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Siobhan Costigan

Sydney NSW 2050, Australia



From: Sharon Davis [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 9:46 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Geoff Parish

Sydney NSW 2048, Australia



[redacted]

From: Sharon Settecasse [redacted]>
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 9:43 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Sharon Settecasse

Sydney NSW 2047, Australia



[redacted]

From: jo Ferguson [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 9:40 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

jo Ferguson

Sydney NSW 2046, Australia



[redacted] [redacted]

From: Louise Farrell [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 9:31 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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

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

I would like to make known by strong objection 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).

Experience and evidence from national and international clearly demonstrates projects such as this which result in toll roads are not only hugely expensive but they are also not an effective means of managing or easing congestion on our roads over the long term. In fact these types of projects result in increased congestion as a consequence if increased overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's current or future congestion problems.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of public funds from the NSW and Federal budgets into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. Funding of $16.8 billion would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, building a better public transport system as well as providing better better social, health and eduction services which would benefit all members of the community, not just those who drive and use tollways. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use, when there are so many social and equity issues that need to be addressed is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The entire WestConnex has been characterised by poor process and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable given the investment of public funds in a project 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 have greater and more sustainable benefits for the broader NSW community.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS,

The EIS relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work. This is despite these projects being both unfunded and, it would appear, as yet unplanned.

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in this EIS but this has not been comprehensive. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is touched on only briefly and not analysed in any great or nuanced detail, despite the level of psychological and social impacts this may well have on families, including children and young people.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The EIS provides no clear, definitive or compelling evidence for why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modelled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done on the impacts for residents living above two stories. This is despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS has not been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, including near schools. It's not acceptable to deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy, particularly children who are able, as yet, to take participate in community consolation and discussion around this project. I note that fine particle pollution can cause deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with additional public transport capacity and connections. Given that some families living in these communities are already under economic stress it will likely result in further inequality being experienced by these families a they are forced to pay tolls to use these roads.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal. I look forward to receiving a written response to each of the objections I have outlined above.

Yours sincerely,

Louise Farrell

Sydney NSW 2130, Australia



[redacted]

From: Janet Stankiewicz <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 9:28 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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

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

In 1960 or '61 the trams from the city out to La Perouse were stopped. My family lived in Hume Street, Chifley and I remember my parents lamenting the loss of the tram system for many years of my childhood. The State Government at that time decided to go with the car industry and petrol industry at the expense of the interests of the public. Such short-sightedness (and possibly greed) led to many more cars on the road and less options for transport for the less well off. Now if my parents could see how badly affected the population of the city of Sydney would be in 1961, why can't this current State Government. We will have more cars and traffic congestion because as we have seen overseas if you build more roads you will increase the number of cars on the road. There will be more pollution and less and less wildlife in our barren, concrete and bitumen lives. Better public transport is the answer and yes, I know this costs money. Everything costs money and if something is wor

th doing then it is worth doing well. We have the chance to do something innovative and clever, something future generations will be thankful for not something to be regretted later. 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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Janet Stankiewicz

Sydney NSW 2193, Australia



[redacted]

From: Melinda Bulger [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 9:23 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Melinda Bulger

Sydney NSW 2044, Australia



[redacted]

From: Amy Finch [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 9:16 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Amy Finch

Sydney NSW 2042, Australia



[redacted]

From: marlise kalt [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 9:12 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, 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).

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St

Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

marlise kalt

Sydney NSW 2043, Australia



[redacted]

From: Ai Quah [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 8:57 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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 is an incredibly short-sighted and uncreative way of solving Sydney's traffic problems, and it is not sustainble in the long run. We need to invest in good infrastructure to make Sydney live up to its name, and highways with more cars are not the future!

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Ai Quah

Sydney NSW 2234, Australia



[redacted]

From: Annabel Kain [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2016 8:52 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

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).

For all the reasons outline below I object to this project. It is incredible that in 2016 we are even having to point out that more roads mean more traffic and more traffic congestion and slower traffics, more pollution, etc. This is not a solution to population growth.

Experience and research from independent experts here in Australia and overseas has shown that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and do not ease congestion over the long term. If anything, such projects make congestion worse by increasing overall traffic volumes as the new road capacity quickly fills up. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex will also divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

The whole WestConnex has also 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.

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 relies on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

The social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas has been assessed in an arrogant and substandard assessment way in this EIS. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

Residents whose homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired for this project are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses in a process that was identified three years ago as being deeply unfair to property owners, adding unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already stressful process. I also object to these acquisitions taking place before this EIS was lodged and any planning approval granted.

The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction has not been properly assessed. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

This project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion rather than easing it.

The threat this project poses to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation, has been poorly analysed and severely underestimated in this EIS. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

The air quality model used in this EIS hasn't been used in Australia before and cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and pollution stacks, 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 deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

This project will force residents of western and south-west Sydney being to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including yours, to approve this project. I 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. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Annabel Kain

Sydney NSW 2193, Australia

