

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

Name: James McCallum

Signature: 

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 135 Womerah Ave

Suburb: Darlinghurst Postcode: 2011

- i. The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.
- ii. The EIS acknowledges that 'rat running' by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.
- iii. I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.
- iv. Traffic operational modelling – Leichhardt. The EIS does not provide any operational modelling for the Darley Road area (8-11), despite the fact 170 vehicles a day are proposed to enter this highly congested (during peak hours) area. Darley Road is a critical arterial road for commuters accessing the City West Link and this analysis should be provided so that impacts can be properly assessed.
- v. Removal of vegetation – Leichhardt. The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the Darley Road site. There are several mature trees located on the north of the site. None of these trees should be removed as they provide precious greenery. They also act as a visual and noise screen for residents from the City West Link traffic. All efforts should be taken to retain the trees and the EIS should not simply permit these trees to be removed without proper investigations being undertaken as to how they can be retained. If they are removed following a proper investigation and consideration of all options, then the approval needs to specify that all streets are replaced with mature, native trees at the conclusion of the construction at the site.
- vi. In the EIS there are indications of what is to be expected in the Rozelle Rail Yards construction site and the Crescent Civil site. But the EIS states that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed. This may result in major changes to the project design and construction methodologies. The community will have no input into this process, so the community is totally powerless to be able to comment on what will actually be proposed, how it will be carried out and what will finally be built. This is not acceptable.
- vii. Permanent substation and water treatment plant – Leichhardt: I object to the location of this facility in our neighbourhood as out of step with the surroundings. If it is retained, then it should be moved to the north of the site, out of view from homes. The residual land should be returned for community purposes such as parkland.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Jacinta Gardner

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 22/6 Northwood Street

Suburb: Camperdown Postcode: 2050

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- ◆ In the EIS there are indications of what is to be expected in the Rozelle Rail Yards construction site and the Crescent Civil site. But the EIS states that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed. This may result in major changes to the project design and construction methodologies. The community will have no input into this process, so the community is totally powerless to be able to comment on what will actually be proposed, how it will be carried out and what will finally be built. This is not acceptable.
- ◆ Many homes around the Rozelle Rail Yards and the Crescent Civil site will be noise affected, some will be highly noise affected. The expected duration of the cumulative works is 120 weeks, almost 3 years, when noise impact will be significant so it is essential that maximum noise mitigation measures are put in place. However the EIS contains only vague details of how mitigation will be carried out. There is no requirement that measures will in fact be carried out to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain specific noise mitigation measures, that can be mandated and enforced. Areas that will be particularly highly noise affected are Bayview Crescent and Railway Parade, the Northern end of Rail Yard site and sections of Lilyfield Rd, Hornsey St, Quirk St and Robert St. Given their proximity, receivers located along Lilyfield Rd between Victoria Road and Gordon St which overlook the Rozelle Yards are likely to experience the greatest construction noise impact within the whole Rozelle area.
- ◆ The three Pollution Stacks in the Rozelle Rail yards are shown to be 38 meters high. This is a totally inappropriate location for these Pollution Stacks. The Rozelle Rail Yards are located in a valley. The Stacks will be on land that is approximately 3.5 meters above sea level. Balmain Road between Wharf Rd and Victoria Road is at an elevation of on average 37 meters. Orange Grove Primary School is at an elevation of 33.4 meters. Areas of Hornsey Rd Rozelle are at 28 meters. Around the junction of Annandale St and Weynton St in Annandale the height above sea level is 29 meters. All these areas are in close proximity to these stacks. All the pollution being exhausted from these stacks will almost be on the same level as these locations and so will be blowing almost directly into these properties, especially in summer when many windows are open. This is not acceptable. In situations of no wind the pollution will accumulate in this valley area and make the surrounding area highly polluted. This is not acceptable. There are also at least 4 schools of Primary age children well within one kilometer of these Stacks. Young children are the most vulnerable to pollution related disease.
- ◆ Permanent substation and water treatment plant – Leichhardt: I object to the location of this facility in our neighbourhood as out of step with the surroundings. If it is retained, then it should be moved to the north of the site, out of view from homes. The residual land should be returned for community purposes such as parkland.
- ◆ I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Kim Grainger

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 1131 Bedford St

Suburb: Newton Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- a. The removal of Buruwan Park between The Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Parade, Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a direct loss of much-needed parkland in this inner city area. Further, Buruwan Park lies on a major cycle route from Railway Parade through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD.
- b. There will be 100 workers a day on the site, with provision for only 10-20 car spaces and there is a concession that local streets will be used, who will be 'encouraged' to use public transport. Our experience with the major construction sites in Haberfield, and St Peters that public transport is not used by the workers and that despite the fact they are not supposed to do so, they park in our local streets and cause strife with our residents.
- c. The EIS admits that air pollutants will exceed permitted levels along the Canal Rd used to access the St Peters Interchange because the traffic will be heavier. This is an unacceptable impact which will adversely affect vehicle users because it is known that people in their vehicles are not protected from the air pollution, as well as anyone on foot or cycling in the streets around the interchange. No amelioration is offered.
- d. Night works - Leichhardt. The EIS states that to minimize disruptions to traffic on the existing road network (including in peak hours) there will be night works where appropriate. Given the congested nature of Darley Road, it is likely there will be frequent night work (EIS, 6.4). This will create an unacceptable impact in residents. It is

unacceptable that a highly unsuitable site has been selected. And, instead of a proper plan to manage traffic, the EIS contemplate work simply occurring at night. This is objected to in the strongest terms.

- e. The EIS states that investigation would be undertaken to confirm whether the Victoria Road bridge is a potential roost site for microbats. There will be attempts to 'manage potential impacts' if confirmed. This is inadequate. The project should not be permitted to impact on vulnerable species.
- f. I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.
- g. I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: KIM GRAINGER Signature: <i>Kim Gray</i>
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	<i>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</i> Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: 1/131 Bedford St Suburb: Newtown Postcode 2042

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application

- The EIS contains no detail of the access tunnel from the Darley Road site to the mainline tunnel other than depicting the route. The approval conditions need to ensure that tunnelling is occurring at sufficient depth so as to not jeopardise the integrity of the homes and not create unacceptable vibration and noise impacts for James Street residents and those at adjacent streets. The approval conditions need to make clear the period of time for which the 'temporary' tunnel is to be used.
- The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)
- The EIS social an economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestCONnex has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.
- Light construction vehicle routes – the EIS acknowledges that these vehicles will use 'dispersed' routes (B-62). In other words, construction vehicles will use and park on local roads. The EIS does not propose any management as to which roads they use. The addition of 70-100 light vehicle movements day in Leichhardt will result in our small, congested streets, which are already at capacity and suffering parking shortages, will have the added impact of workers travelling to and from the site and parking in local streets. There will be rat running. The EIS should provide an agreed route (using arterial roads only) that can be used by all vehicles associated with the project.
- The Rozelle Rail Yards are a totally inappropriate area to create a new recreational area because the area will be highly polluted by unfiltered Pollution Stacks and Tunnel Portals. In the EIS it is referred to as an idealized area. "It is envisaged that the quantum of active recreation within the Rozelle Rail Yards would be further developed by others as projects such as The Bays Precinct are developed. The concept plan provides spaces that could include an array of active recreation opportunities and even community facilities such as gardens or a school." The suggestion that this would be a suitable location for a School is just beyond belief and demonstrates that those who have put these plans together are either staggeringly ignorant or totally delusional! At a time when major World cities are doing all they can to address the dire problems of pollution this is an appalling suggestion that is totally out of touch.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Kim GRANGER

Signature:

Kim Granger

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

1/131 Bedford Road

Suburb:

Newtown

Postcode

2062

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- a) It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.
- b) Crash statistics – City West Link and James St intersection. The EIS only analyses crash statistics near the interchanges. It does not provide any detail as to the number of crashes at the James St/City West Link intersection which, on Transport for NSW's own figures, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Nor does it comment on the two fatalities that occurred on Darley Road near the proposed construction site. The EIS needs to detail the increased risk in crashes that will be caused by the additional 170 vehicles a day that are proposed to enter and leave Darley Road during the construction period.
- c) The EIS states that by 2033 Ross St will see an increase of 80 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. The greatest increase of Heavy vehicles at the PM peak will be in Johnston Street, which will see an increase of about 30–50 vehicles when compared to the 'without project' scenario. At Catherine St there will be an increase of 30 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. These streets will see a huge increase in Heavy vehicle movements if Stage 3 is built. The increase would be roughly half this amount if the project did not go ahead. Annexure Fig 26 B2 Section H
- d) The EIS shows a diagrammatic explanation of the way the polluted air will be expelled from the Westconnex tunnels. This method will work on straight tunnels of short distance providing there is no traffic congestion. There are already signs in tunnel locations in Sydney advising motorists to roll up their windows and put on their 'in vehicle circulating' air conditioning. This type of straight line pollution expulsion doesn't work if the tunnels go around corners, which is the case with the tunnels from the Rozelle Rail Yards site.
- e) The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.
- f) I am concerned that the EIS provides no reasons why the City of Sydney's alternative plan might not be preferable to the proposed WestCONnex.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Jessie Conn

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 118 Calender St

Suburb: Enmore Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
 Link

- ◆ The presence of 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day at this site will create an unacceptable risk to students. The EIS should not permit any truck movements near the Darley Road site. The alternative proposal which provides that all spoil trucks enter and leave from the City West link is the only proposal that should be considered.
- ◆ The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other.
- ◆ We object to the location of the Darley Road civil and construction site because the site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. It is already congested at peak hours and the intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
- ◆ The EIS acknowledges that four years of M4/M5 construction would have a negative economic and social impact across the Inner West through interrupted traffic routes, slower traffic times, disruption with public transport, interruption with businesses and loss of connections across communities. This finding highlights the need for a proper cost benefit analysis for the project. Such social costs should not simply be dismissed with the promise of a construction plan into which the community has not input or powers to enforce.
- ◆ The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.
- ◆ I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Amy Basha

Signature:

AS

Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

Suburb:

Balmann

Postcode

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other.
- The EIS uses maps indicating alignment of the mainline tunnels. It is clear from more detailed reading deep into the EIS (ie 12-57 Sydney Water Tunnels) that the alignment and depths of the tunnels may vary very significantly, after further survey work has been done and construction methodology determined by the construction contractor. The maps provided in the EIS are nothing more than 'indicative' and are misleading the community. The EIS should be withdrawn, corrected and updated, and reissued for genuine public comment based on 'definitive' information.
- The justification for this project relies on the completion of other projects such as the Western Harbour Tunnel which has not yet been planned, let alone approved.
- Are there other potentially serious problems with Sydney Water utility services (described at EIS 12-57) or with other utilities in other suburbs or along the proposed M4-M5 tunnel alignment? If so, the EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these are all disclosed, researched, surveyed and the resolution publicly published.
- The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters, Haberfield and Rozelle Interchanges will disrupt local transport networks including bus and active transport (walking and cycling).
- I oppose the destruction of any more of Sydney's heritage for WestCONnex. I am appalled that Sydney Motorway Corporation is seeking approval to tunnel under hundreds of highly valued heritage buildings in Newtown without any serious assessment of risk at all. This heritage belongs to all of Sydney.
- I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.
- It is clear that the tunnel portals will be major sites for more traffic congestion. Some intersections that are currently very congested will be just as bad in 2033.
- No road junction as large and complex as the extraordinary spaghetti junction proposed to go underground has been built anywhere in the world. The feasibility is not tested. There are no international or national standards for such a construction.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485


Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Ashley Schultz

Signature:



Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

6 ISABELLA ST

Suburb:

CAMPERDOWN

Postcode


2050

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- 1) The EIS proposes that all trucks will arrive at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site from Haberfield and travel along Darley Road to the site, with a right-hand turn now permitted into James Street. The proposed route will result in a truck every 3-4 minutes for 5 years running directly by the small houses on Darley Road. These homes will not be habitable during the five-year construction period due to the unacceptable noise impacts. The truck noise will be worsened by their need to travel up a steep hill to return to the City West Link, so the noise impacts will affect not just those homes on or immediately adjacent to Darley Road.
- 2) Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.
- 3) The Darley Road site will not be returned after the project, with a substantial portion permanently housing a Motorways Operations facility which involves a substation and water treatment plant. This means that the residents will not be able to directly access the North Light rail Station from Darley Road but will have to traverse Canal Road and use the narrow path from the side. In addition the presence of this facility reduces the utility of this vital land which could be turned into a community facility. Over the past 12 months community representatives were repeatedly told that the land would be returned and this has not occurred. We also object to the location of this type of infrastructure in a neighbourhood setting.
- 4) Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.
- 5) The EIS states that darley Road is a contaminated site, and likely has asbestos. The proposal is that 'treated' water will be directly discharged into the stormwater drain at Blackmore oval. There are four long-standing rowing clubs in the vicinity of this location. This plan will jeopardise the integrity of our waterway and compromise the use of the bay for recreational activities for boat and other users. We object in the strongest terms to this proposal on environmental and health reasons. There is no detail of the ongoing Motorway maintenance activities during operation provided in the EIS. The community therefore cannot comment on the impact that this ongoing facility will have on the locality. This component of the EIS should not be approved as this information is not provided and therefore impacts (on parking, safety, noise, amenity of the area) are not known.
- 6) It all very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Aiden Miller-Powell</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>1/30 Northmead Ave</u> Suburb: <u>Northmead</u> Postcode <u>2152</u>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years		

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used. The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective.
- The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction. (Executive Summary xviii)
- The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the site which includes a mature tree. I object to the removal of the tree which creates a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the tree is removed it must be replaced with a mature tree as soon as the remediation of the site commences.
- Hundreds of risks associated with this project have not been assessed but have instead been deferred to a detailed design stage into which the public will have no input. I call on the Department of Planning to reject this inadequate EIS that has been prepared by AECOM that has multiple commercial interests in WestConnex.
- The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street will greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased by the time Stage 3 is completed. It states that Stage 3 will do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at Peak times. This will be highly negative for the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through the local areas on local streets.
- Acquisition of Dan Murphys – I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the tax payer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances
- Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____


Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Jessica Pereira

Signature: 

Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 20 Eve Street, #

Suburb: Erskineville Postcode 2043

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- There have been widespread reports in the media about extensive unresolved disputes regarding damages to houses in the Stage 1 M4 and Stage 2 M5 construction process. Why should the community believe that there will not be extensive damages to houses in Stage 3?
- Because this is still based on a "concept design" it is unknown how the communities affected will not know what is being done below their residences, schools, business premises and public spaces, particularly if the whole project is sold into a private corporation's ownership before the actual designs and construction plans are determined. The EIS makes references to these designs and plans being reviewed but there is **NO** information as to what agency will be responsible for such reviews or whether the outcomes of such reviews will be made public. The communities below whose homes, business premises, public buildings and public spaces this massive project will be excavated and built will be completely in the dark about what is being done, what standards it is supposed to comply with, what inspection or scrutiny it will subject to, and whether the private corporations undertaking the work will be held to any liability by our government.
- It is quite clear that the escalating cost of tolls will encourage drivers to avoid tollways. This will further pollute and congest local roads. Such impact already evident on Parramatta Rd usage after the new M4 tolls were introduced. The community expects similar impacts on roads around the St Peters interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Enmore and Edgeware Roads and though streets of Alexandria and Erskineville. The EIS Traffic analysis fails to deal with this issue of traffic beyond the boundaries of the project and should be rejected.
- It all very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- I am concerned that SMC has selected one of Sydney's most dangerous traffic spots, Darley Rd in Leichhardt for a construction site that will bring hundreds of extra trucks and cars into the area on a daily basis for years.
- The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.
- I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. The government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.
- The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.
- I am deeply disappointed that the EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain. This is a dangerous and reckless attempt to get approval for a project that is yet to be properly designed.
- The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other. The increasing numbers of vehicles will also increase the vehicle pollution (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic) in this area.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment Application Number: SSI 7485 GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	From: Name: <i>Jessica Pereira</i> Address: <i>20 Eve St, Erskineville</i>
Application Name: Westconnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <i>NSW</i> Postcode <i>2043</i>
Declaration : I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

I object to the whole of the Westconnex Project, including the Westconnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS, for the following reasons :

1. The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors. I have serious concerns that such a complex project with hundreds of risks could be treated by NSW politicians as if approval was a foregone conclusion.
 2. There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.
 3. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. We now have proposals for Stages 1,2 and 3 and none achieve this goal. The community is asked to support this proposal on the basis of other major unfunded projects, which are little more than ideas on a map. This is NOT the way to plan a liveable city.
 4. I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process.
 5. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters Interchange will have a disruptive impact on the local transport networks comprising vehicle, bus and active transport (walking and cycling).
 6. I oppose the destruction of any more of Sydney's heritage for WestCONnex. I am appalled that WestCONnex are seeking approval to tunnel under hundreds of heritage buildings in Newtown without no serious assessment of risks at all.
 7. It is quite clear that the escalating cost of tolls will encourage drivers to avoid tollways. This will further pollute and congest local roads. Such impact was evident on Parramatta Rd usage immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. The community expects similar impacts on the roads around the St Peters interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Enmore and Edgeware Roads and though streets of Alexandria and Erskineville. The Traffic analysis fails to deal with this issue of traffic beyond the boundaries of the project and should be rejected.
 8. I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.
 9. Increased traffic congestion will also increase the atmospheric pollution along roadsides in local areas, with predicted adverse impacts on breathing and through long term carcinogenic effects. The maps and analysis of the pollution effects in the EIS should be presented in a way that they can be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.
 10. Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. An extra exhaust stack on the NW corner of the St Peters interchange will increase pollution in an area where the prevailing winds will spread emissions over residences, schools and sports fields. St Peters Primary School will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the SW and NW corners of the interchange.
 11. The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link – in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area – in Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because contractors will blame the other project.
- In this submission I have only been able to include some of my objections to this EIS. We have already witnesses the destruction of tracts of Haberfield and St Peters. Please do not allow the Sydney Motorway Corporation and its contractors to further extend this damage.

I call on the Secretary of the Planning Department to advise the Minister for Planning to reject this project and demand that the government re-think the transport planning for the whole metropolitan area with active consideration and comparison of heavy and light rail alternatives.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Shaugh Anres

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 70 Minter Street

Suburb: Canterbury Postcode: 2193

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- a) The Concept Design was a woefully inadequate document totally devoid of any real depth of detail in terms of maps, scales, distances with only vague suggestions and glamorized Artist's Impressions of an idealized view of what Stage 3 would be like. It was another example of current city planning documents that consistently accentuate huge areas of tranquil green spaces with families and children out walking and riding bicycles in idealized parks and suburbs. All this is total PR spin and bears no reality about the real outcome of the build. It bears no reality as to what Stage 3 of Westconnex will be like.
- b) Along with the widening of the Crescent at Annandale the White's Creek bridge is to be rebuilt. This will mean that the road in this area will be reduced in width as first one side of the bridge is rebuilt followed by the other. Added to the additional volume of trucks from the Rozelle Rail Yards, the Crescent Civil site and the Camperdown site this is going to lead to massive congestion on Johnston St and all along the Crescent towards Ross St and make it virtually impossible for residents to exit and return to their local area. It is most likely that the commercial sectors of the Tramsheds development will be badly affected.
- c) Truck routes – Leichhardt: No trucks should be permitted on Darley Road or local roads in Leichhardt or Lilyfield. The EIS proposes that all trucks will arrive at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site from Haberfield and travel along Darley Road to the site, with a right-hand turn now permitted into James Street. The proposed route will result in a truck every 3-4 minutes for 5 years running directly by the small houses on Darley Road. These homes will not be habitable during the five-year construction period due to the unacceptable noise impacts. The truck noise will be worsened by their need to travel up a steep hill to return to the City West Link, so the noise impacts will affect not just those homes on or immediately adjacent to Darley Road. The proposal to run trucks so close to homes is dangerous and there have been two fatalities on Darley Road at the proposed site location. The EIS does not propose any noise or safety barriers to address this. Despite the unacceptable impact to nearby homes, there is no proposal for noise walls, nor any mitigation to individual homes.
- d) I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project, There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Peters and Haberfield or Rozelle, all traffic going to the CBD, East or into the Inner West will use local roads.
- e) One toll road leads to another 3 being proposed. The EIS's for the M4 East and the New M5 argued the case that serious congestion created near interchanges would be solved once the M4/M5 was built. Now it seems this is not the case and more roads will be needed to relieve the congestion – WHERE DOES THIS END? According to the M4/M5 EIS the real benefits will depend on building the Western Harbour Tunnel, the Airport Link and a tollway heading South. None of these projects have been planned, let alone approved but yet are part of addressing the congestion impacts acknowledged for the M4/M5link project. Given this how is it possible to know or address the impacts of the M4/M5 Link, unless this is just yet more justification for yet more roads?

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties


Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: **CARRE KABLEAN**Signature: 

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: **5 WULUMET CLOSE**Suburb: **ROZELLE**Postcode **2039**

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

1. The EIS admits that air pollutants will exceed permitted levels along the Canal Rd used to access the St Peters Interchange because the traffic will be heavier. This is an unacceptable impact which will adversely affect vehicle users because it is known that people in their vehicles are not protected from the air pollution, as well as anyone on foot or cycling in the streets around the interchange. No amelioration is offered.
2. The EIS states that traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange is expected to be worse after completion of the M5 and the M4-M5 Link particularly in the evening peak hour. The EIS admits that this will have a "moderate negative" impact on the neighbourhood in increasing pollution (also admitted separately) therefore in health impacts, on safety for foot and cycle traffic but also for vehicles and on the local amenity.
3. The traffic around St Peters expected to be heavier because of the increased road access to the new Interchange will adversely affect our community because moving around to our parks and to the shops, to the buses and to the train stations, for pedestrians and cars, will be more difficult. Our community is being sacrificed for the marginal improvement in traffic movement elsewhere in Sydney. No measures to ameliorate the impact are mentioned. This is unacceptable.
4. The EIS admits that the increased traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange will impact on bus running times especially in the evening peak hour and increase the time taken (2.5 minutes, which seems optimistic). The 422 bus and associated cross city services which use the Princes Highway are notorious for irregular running times because of the congestion on the Princes highway and cross roads, so an admitted worsening of the running time will adversely impact the people who are dependent on the buses. This will be compounded by the loss of train services at St Peters station while it is closed for the Sydney Metro build and then subsequently when it re-opens. In all the impact of the new M5 and the M4-M5 link is to worsen access to public transport significantly for the residents of the St Peters neighbourhood.
5. It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Norm Short

Signature: N Short

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: PO Box 1006

Suburb: Windsor NSW Postcode 2756

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- 1) The EIS states that there may be a 'small increase in pollutant concentrations' near surface roads. The EIS states that potential health impacts associated with changes in air quality (specifically nitrogen dioxide and particulates) within the local community have been assessed and are considered to be 'acceptable.' We disagree that the impacts on human health are acceptable and object to the project in its entirety because of these impacts.
- 2) There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.
- 3) The EIS currently permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the site (and based on experience with cars accessing the site for Dan Murphy's), queuing will be the norm and not the exception. The EIS needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads
- 4) The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.
- 5) I object to the location of a permanent substation and water treatment plant following the completion of the project on the Darley Road site. This will limit the future uses of the land and the community has been continually assured that the land, which is Government-owned, would be available for community purposes. The presence of this facility will forever prevent the ability for safe and direct pedestrian access to the light rail stop, with users required to walk down a dark and winding path. It will also limit the future use of the site. If a permanent facility is to be located then it should be moved to the north of the site so that it is out of sight of homes and has less visual impact on residents.
- 6) The EIS states that there are 'investigations' occurring into alternative access to the Darley Road site. The EIS does not provide any detail on which residents can comment about alternative access which would keep trucks off Darley Road. No spoil truck movements should be permitted on Darley Road and the plans for alternative access should be expedited. It should be a condition of approval that the alternative access is confirmed and that no spoil trucks are permitted to access Darley Road due to the unacceptable noise, safety and traffic issues that the current proposal creates

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: JENNY HOWARD

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 48 HOLMWOOD ST

Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- I. (6-51) The EIS needs to mandate that these measures are in place. Where mentioned, the acoustic shed that is considered offers the lower grade noise protection. This is despite the fact that 36 'sensitive receivers' are identified in the EIS, who will have extreme noise disturbance through much of the 5-year construction period. In addition, the acoustic shed covers only the spoil and spoil handling area and not the tunnel entrances and exits. The highest level of noise protection, which is only suggested in the EIS, needs to be mandated in the EIS. In addition, the shed needs to cover both the entrance and exit to the site and not simply the spoil handling areas. The independent engineer's report (commissioned by the Inner West council) states that it is likely, because of the elevated position of the site, that it is likely an acoustic shed will not contain the noise to an acceptable level. In addition, a temporary access tunnel will be built from the top of the site and run directly under homes in James Street. These homes will be unacceptably impacted by the construction noise and truck movements without these additional measures
- II. I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.
- III. The EIS states that these will occur near the Darley Road site. There is no detail provided, nor is there a process by which residents can influence such

decisions. The Inner West Council's documents state that Darley Road is not built to normal road requirements and safety standards, as it was established as an access road for the former goods line. Two fatalities have occurred near the site location, with many accidents. The Council has been trying to make Darley Road a safer route for many years. Elwick Street North for example was partially closed as a result of a fatality. The approval conditions need to make it clear that all road closures need to be made in consultation with residents affected and that the safety issues are adequately addressed. No arterial traffic from Darley Road should be allowed to be diverted onto narrow local roads

- IV. The proposed work hours for the Rozelle Rail Yards are tunnelling and spoil handling 24 hours a day seven days a week. Civil construction Mon - Fri 7.00am - 6.00pm, Sat 8.00am - 1.00 pm. There will be no night work at The Crescent Civil Site and the daytime hours are stated to be the same as at the Rozelle Rail Yards. However as has been experienced by those at Haberfield and St Peters these hours and especially late and night work have been extended and implemented when the schedule has fallen behind and this has lead to physical and mental stress for many residents through interrupted sleep and loss of sleep especially with children. The roads and sites at night in the area will see a marked increase in noise from truck movements, truck reversing alarms and running machinery. It will also see a marked increase in light during the night hours with site illumination and vehicle head lights as has been experienced in other areas. These problems have not been properly addressed and are not adequately dealt with in the EIS.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____


Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: Elizabeth Marie	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: [Signature]	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: 18 Kerr Ave	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: Hurlingham Postcode: 2193	

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- i. The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.
- ii. The social and economic impact study fails to record the great concern for valued Newtown heritage
- iii. The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.
- iv. The consultants for the Social and Economic Impact study is HillPDA. This company has a conflict of interest and is not an appropriate choice to do a social impact study of WestCONnex. Amongst its services it offers property valuation services and promotes property development in what are perceived to be strategic locations. HillPDA were heavily involved in work leading to the development of Urban Growth NSW and the heavily criticised Parramatta Rd Study. It is not in the public interest to use public funds on an EIS done by a company that has such a heavy stake in property development opportunities along the Parramatta Rd corridor. One of the advantages of property development along Parramatta Rd that Hill PDA promotes on its website is the 33 kilometre WestCONnex.
- v. The EIS acknowledges that extra construction traffic will add to travel times across the Inner West and have a negative impact on businesses in the area. No compensation is suggested. These impacts are not been taken into account of evaluating the cost of WestCONnex.
- vi. The EIS acknowledges that 'rat running' by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.
- vii. The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.
- viii. Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name:..... <u>Natasha Miller</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature:..... 	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>58 Clarendon Rd</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Stanmore</u>Postcode: <u>2048</u>	

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application.**

- ◆ Rozelle Rail Yards and Rozelle Civil Site. It is clear that the most highly affected area of Stage 3 will be the Rozelle area and the massive and hugely complex Rozelle interchange. The suggestion that Westconnex is capable of building this is highly questionable. Nothing like this has been built anywhere else in the World. Considering the simple problems of dust management, noxious gasses and the handling of toxic materials like asbestos that have been so inappropriately dealt with on Stages 1 and 2 by Westconnex this intersection of Stage 3 is a disaster waiting to happen and should definitely not be allowed to proceed without a massive investigation. What has been shown in the EIS is totally inadequate for this project to be allowed to proceed.
- ◆ The proposed work hours for the Rozelle Rail Yards are tunnelling and spoil handling 24 hours a day seven days a week. Civil construction Mon - Fri 7.00am – 6.00pm, Sat 8.00am -1.00 pm. There will be no night work at The Crescent Civil Site and the daytime hours are stated to be the same as at the Rozelle Rail Yards. However as has been experienced by those at Haberfield and St Peters these hours and especially late and night work have been extended and implemented when the schedule has fallen behind and this has lead to physical and mental stress for many residents through interrupted sleep and loss of sleep especially with children. The roads and sites at night in the area will see a marked increase in noise from truck movements, truck reversing alarms and running machinery. It will also see a marked increase in light during the night hours with site illumination and vehicle head lights as has been experienced in other areas. These problems have not been properly addressed and are not adequately dealt with in the EIS.
- ◆ The tunnels under Rozelle/Lilyfield are going to be in three levels. The EIS does not explain what safety procedures are being built into the project to deal with situations like serious congestion, accidents or fire. With a serious hold up on the deepest of these tunnels it is clear that the air quality will very quickly become toxic unless substantial air conditioning is a major part of the design. There is no in depth detail about how these issues are going to be addressed. This is not acceptable.
- ◆ One of the main reasons for establishing Buruwan Park was as a relatively quiet nature corridor for wildlife not for successions of children's parties so the assessment of this area in the EIS is entirely blinkered and inaccurate. The Rozelle Rail Yards site that may appear to development driven planners as an unattractive and wasted eyesore is ironically a very important nature reserve. It is perhaps the only area in the Annandale/Glebe area where Fairy Wrens can be found because of the substantial bush cover. This is very important as where these birds are found nature tends to be in balance which is not the case in parks like Easton Park and Bicentennial Park.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Natasha Miller

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: Clarendon Rd

Suburb: Stannmore Postcode 2048

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- i. The City West Link Eastbound AM and PM peak hour and other locations. "Table 7-19 shows that several locations are forecast to exceed theoretical roadway capacity with the increased background traffic and the construction traffic in the 2021 AM and PM peak hours. However, traffic on the majority of these roads would exceed their theoretical capacity even without the construction traffic, simply due to the growth in background traffic". So in the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, massive amounts of construction traffic are going to be added for the whole construction period of 5 years. Even on completion it is stated in the EIS that traffic will be worse in this area than 'without the project'. This categorically shows that the planning of Westconnex is totally inadequate and needs major changes. It also shows that when completed Westconnex will not work. It is abundantly obvious that Rail/Metro is the only option to radically overhaul Sydney's failed transport systems
- ii. The Health costs of outdoor Air Pollution in Australia are up to \$8.4 Billion a year. The Health costs of Particulate Pollution in the Sydney Greater Metropolitan area is around \$4.7 Billion a year. With no filtration on the Westconnex tunnels these Health costs will rise substantially.
- iii. Motor vehicles account for 14% of Particulate Pollution of 2.5 microns and less in Australia. There is no safe level to exposure to particulate matter of 2.5 microns and less. Particulate matter is linked with Asthma, Lung Disease, Cancer and Stroke.
- iv. Noise mitigation – Leichhardt. The noise mitigation proposed in the EIS is unacceptable. No detail of noise walls is provided, giving residents no opportunity to comment on whether final impacts are acceptable. This is despite the fact 36 homes are identified in the EIS as severely affected by construction noise. The acoustic shed proposed is of the lowest grade and does not cover the entire site, resulting in noise impacts from the movement of trucks in and out of the tunnel access point. The highest grade acoustic shed should be provided, with the shed covering the entire site. The additional noise mitigation such as noise walls, need to be det out in detail so that residents can properly comment on the impacts.
- v. I am concerned that the AECOM, the company responsible for the EIS, always approves knocking down heritage buildings if the project requires it. It doesn't how much value it holds for the community, it must always be destroyed.
- vi. The decision to build a three-stage tollway instead of expanding public transport has never been subjected to democratic decision-making and in fact has been opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages.
- vii. Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution– most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a massive number of extra truck movements and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485


Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Natesha Miller

Signature:



Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

Clarendon Rd

Suburb:

Stammar

Postcode

2048

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- ⇒ The EIS was released just 12 days after the closing date for submissions to the Concept Design. This categorically proves that all the Community Consultations and Submissions to the Concept Design were a total sham. There were at least 800 posts on the interactive map. These were limited as the community only had 140 characters available to make their point which was woefully inadequate. But there were at least 1500 written submissions, some of which were highly detailed and of considerable length. There is no way that all these submissions could have been read, considered, their arguments integrated into the EIS and then for the EIS of 7200 pages to be put together, printed and released 12 days after the the closing date for submissions to the Concept Design. There needs to be a major investigation into this flagrant abuse of the way NSW planning laws have been flouted for the whole of Westconnex and particularly Stage 3.
- ⇒ The EIS states that by 2033 Ross St will see an increase of 80 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. The greatest increase of Heavy vehicles at the PM peak will be in Johnston Street, which will see an increase of about 30-50 vehicles when compared to the 'without project' scenario. At Catherine St there will be an increase of 30 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. These streets will see a huge increase in Heavy vehicle movements if Stage 3 is built. The increase would be roughly half this amount if the project did not go ahead. Annexure Fig 26 B2 Section H
- ⇒ The EIS shows a diagrammatic explanation of the way the polluted air will be expelled from the Westconnex tunnels. This method will work on straight tunnels of short distance providing there is no traffic congestion. There are already signs in tunnel locations in Sydney advising motorists to roll up their windows and put on their 'in vehicle circulating' air conditioning. This type of straight line pollution expulsion doesn't work if the tunnels go around corners, which is the case with the tunnels from the Rozelle Rail Yards site.
- ⇒ The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.
- ⇒ I am concerned that the EIS provides no reasons why the City of Sydney's alternative plan might not be preferable to the proposed WestCONnex.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>J. McDonnell</i>
	Address: <i>55 Silver St</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>St Peters</i> Postcode <i>2044</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>J McDonnell</i>
Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. I am deeply disappointed that the EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain. This is a dangerous and reckless attempt to get approval for a project that is yet to be properly designed.
2. This EIS provides no basis on which to approve such a complex project including the building of interchanges underneath Sydney suburbs Rozelle and Leichhardt. It would be absurd to approve the building of up to three tunnels under people's homes on the basis of such flimsy information.
3. Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex, yet there are no detailed construction plans. It is not enough to say there will be mitigation if negative impacts unfold. An EIS should assess risks and be able to predict whether they are worth risking and if so, what mitigation should be necessary.
4. The justification for this project relies on the completion of other projects such as the Western Harbour Tunnel which has not yet been planned, let alone approved.
5. It is clear that the tunnel portals will be major sites for more traffic congestion. Some intersections that are currently very congested will be just as bad in 2033.
6. I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. The government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.
7. I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.
8. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters, Haberfield and Rozelle Interchanges will disrupt local transport networks including bus and active transport (walking and cycling).
9. I oppose the destruction of any more of Sydney's heritage for WestCONnex. I am appalled that Sydney Motorway Corporation is seeking approval to tunnel under hundreds of highly valued heritage buildings in Newtown without any serious assessment of risk at all. This heritage belongs to all of Sydney.
10. I have read the warm and caring words contained in the EIS, ref Sustainability Management Strategy. What purpose do these serve if they are not reflected in actual plans. They simply highlight the wanton destruction of homes, trees and habitat already.
11. There has been no 'meaningful' consultation with the community. Some areas affected by M3/M5 have not even been letterboxed by SMC. These include St Peters and sections of Erskineville. The SMC received hundreds of submissions on its concept design and failed to respond to any of these before lodging this EIS.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Sam Turrin

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration : I HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 292 Enmore Road

Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2204

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- i. The City West Link Eastbound AM and PM peak hour and other locations. "Table 7-19 shows that several locations are forecast to exceed theoretical roadway capacity with the increased background traffic and the construction traffic in the 2021 AM and PM peak hours. However, traffic on the majority of these roads would exceed their theoretical capacity even without the construction traffic, simply due to the growth in background traffic". So in the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, massive amounts of construction traffic are going to be added for the whole construction period of 5 years. Even on completion it is stated in the EIS that traffic will be worse in this area than 'without the project'. This categorically shows that the planning of Westconnex is totally inadequate and needs major changes. It also shows that when completed Westconnex will not work. It is abundantly obvious that Rail/Metro is the only option to radically overhaul Sydney's failed transport systems
- ii. The Health costs of outdoor Air Pollution in Australia are up to \$8.4 Billion a year. The Health costs of Particulate Pollution in the Sydney Greater Metropolitan area is around \$4.7 Billion a year. With no filtration on the Westconnex tunnels these Health costs will rise substantially.
- iii. Motor vehicles account for 14% of Particulate Pollution of 2.5 microns and less in Australia. There is no safe level to exposure to particulate matter of 2.5 microns and less. Particulate matter is linked with Asthma, Lung Disease, Cancer and Stroke.
- iv. Noise mitigation – Leichhardt. The noise mitigation proposed in the EIS is unacceptable. No detail of noise walls is provided, giving residents no opportunity to comment on whether final impacts are acceptable. This is despite the fact 36 homes are identified in the EIS as severely affected by construction noise. The acoustic shed proposed is of the lowest grade and does not cover the entire site, resulting in noise impacts from the movement of trucks in and out of the tunnel access point. The highest grade acoustic shed should be provided, with the shed covering the entire site. The additional noise mitigation such as noise walls, need to be det out in detail so that residents can properly comment on the impacts.
- v. I am concerned that the AECOM, the company responsible for the EIS, always approves knocking down heritage buildings if the project requires it. It doesn't how much value it holds for the community, it must always be destroyed.
- vi. The decision to build a three-stage tollway instead of expanding public transport has never been subjected to democratic decision-making and in fact has been opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages.
- vii. Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution– most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a massive number of extra truck movements and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>E. Cogger</i> Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <i><u>Dedication</u> : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: <i>147 Probert St</i> Suburb: <i>Newtown</i> Postcode <i>2042</i>

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application

- I. The EIS does not provide appropriate parking for the estimated 100 or so workers that the EIS states will work every day at the site, while other equivalent sites have allocated parking for such workers (Northcote Civil site (150)) and Parramatta Road East Civil site (140). It is also noted that the EIS provides for loss of 20 residential parks on Darley Road. Local streets are at capacity already because of the lack of off-street parking for many residents and the Light Rail stop which means that commuters use local streets. The EIS states that workers 'will be encouraged to use public transport.' the EIS needs to mandate that no trucks or construction vehicles are to park in local streets. There needs to be a requirement that is enforceable that workers use the Light Rail stop which is adjacent to the site or a plan to bus in workers
- II. The EIS does not require an acoustic shed and states that 'Acoustic barriers and devices at the access tunnel entrances would be considered and implemented where reasonable and feasible to minimise potential noise impacts associated with out-of-hours works within the tunnels.'
- III. The EIS contains no detail of the access tunnel from the Darley Road site to the mainline tunnel other than depicting the route. The approval conditions need to ensure that tunnelling is occurring at sufficient depth so as to not jeopardise the integrity of the homes and not create unacceptable vibration and noise impacts for James Street residents and those at adjacent streets. The approval conditions need to make clear the period of time for which the 'temporary' tunnel is to be used.
- IV. The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)
- V. The EIS social an economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestCONnex has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.
- VI. Light construction vehicle routes – the EIS acknowledges that these vehicles will use 'dispersed' routes (8-62). In other words, construction vehicles will use and park on local roads. The EIS does not propose any management as to which roads they use. The addition of 70-100 light vehicle movements day in Leichhardt will result in our small, congested streets, which are already at capacity and suffering parking shortages, will have the added impact of workers travelling to and from the site and parking in local streets. There will be rat running. The EIS should provide an agreed route (using arterial roads only) that can be used by all vehicles associated with the project.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Luke Vanderzeil

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 52 Newman Street

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The removal of spoil at the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to the largest amount of Spoil truck movements on the entire Stage 3 project: 517 Heavy truck movements a day, of which 46 are stated to take place at Peak hours. There will also be 10 Heavy truck movements a day from the Crescent Civil Site. The sheer number of trucks on the road will lead to massive increases in congestion. Maps in the EIS have the spoil trucks going to and from these sites from the Haberfield direction on the City West Link. This is also the direction that is being proposed for spoil truck movements from Darley Rd which is said to have 100 Heavy truck movements a day. It is stated that the cumulative effect of truck movements from all sites on the City West Link will be 700 (one way) Heavy truck movements a day and of that 208 will be in Peak hours. This plan totally lacks credibility.
- The Rozelle Rail Yards site is the location of 3 Unfiltered Pollution Stacks. There is a fourth stack on Victoria Rd close to Darling St. If the Western Harbour Tunnel is built there will also be a total of 7 Tunnel Portals. Tunnel Portals are also areas of high levels of pollution. It is totally unacceptable that the Pollution Stacks are unfiltered. In 2008 Gladys Berejiklian said of Labor "It's not too late, the Government can still ensure that filtration is a possibility. World's best practice is to filter tunnels. Why won't Labor allow people to sleep at night, knowing their children aren't inhaling toxins that could jeopardize their health now or in the future." It is totally unacceptable that the tunnels will not be filtered. Recently built tunnels in Tokyo successfully filter 98% of all pollutants.
- Generally the risk of settlement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35m. In the Rozelle area the tunnel will be at 30m in the Brockley St & Cheltenham St area, and it will be less than that in the Denison St area. Also it is planned to have another layer of tunnels above that in the Denison St area. From the cross section diagram Vol 2B appendix E part 2 the suggestion is that this higher level of tunnels will be at no more than 12m. This is of major concern. Numbers of people in the ongoing construction of Stage 1 and 2 have suffered extensive damage to their homes costing thousands of dollars to rectify caused by vibration and tunneling activities and although they followed all the elected procedures their claims have not been settled. This is totally unacceptable. There is nothing addressing these major concerns in the EIS.
- The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres underground. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 27metres. Piper St 37metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

<p>Attention Director Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Christine Moffat</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>[Signature]</u></p> <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. <u>I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</u></p> <p>Address: <u>8 Gilpin St</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Camperdown</u> Postcode <u>2050</u></p>
---	---

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- The EIS needs to require that all workers are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads at the Darley Road site. This is justified because the site provides 11 car spaces for an estimated 100 workers a day on site. The project cannot be approved on this basis without a strict requirement on workers to use public transport or project provided transport and a prohibition needs to be in place against parking on local streets. The EIS needs to require that this restriction is included in all contracts and in the relevant approval documentation
- The EIS uses maps indicating alignment of the mainline tunnels. It is clear from more detailed reading deep into the EIS (ie 12-57 Sydney Water Tunnels) that the alignment and depths of the tunnels may vary very significantly, after further survey work has been done and construction methodology determined by the construction contractor. The maps provided in the EIS are nothing more than 'indicative' and are misleading the community. The EIS should be withdrawn, corrected and updated, and reissued for genuine public comment based on 'definitive' information.
- The EIS proposes that all trucks will arrive at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site from Haberfield and travel along Darley Road to the site, with a right-hand turn now permitted into James Street. The proposed route will result in a truck every 3-4 minutes for 5 years running directly by the small houses on Darley Road. These homes will not be habitable during the five-year construction period due to the unacceptable noise impacts. The truck noise will be worsened by their need to travel up a steep hill to return to the City West Link, so the noise impacts will affect not just those homes on or immediately adjacent to Darley Road.
- Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.
- The Darley Road site will not be returned after the project, with a substantial portion permanently housing a Motorways Operations facility which involves a substation and water treatment plant. This means that the residents will not be able to directly access the North Light rail Station from Darley Road but will have to traverse Canal Road and use the narrow path from the side. In addition the presence of this facility reduces the utility of this vital land which could be turned into a community facility. Over the past 12 months community representatives were repeatedly told that the land would be returned and this has not occurred. We also object to the location of this type of infrastructure in a neighbourhood setting.
- Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name:..... *Christine Moffat*

Signature:..... *[Signature]*

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:..... *8 Gilpin St*

Suburb:..... *Campbelltown*Postcode..... *2056*

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- ⇒ The justification for this project relies on the completion of other projects such as the Western Harbour Tunnel which has not yet been planned, let alone approved.
- ⇒ The proposal to run trucks so close to homes is dangerous. There have been two fatalities on Darley Road at the proposed site location. The EIS does not propose any noise or safety barriers to address this. Despite the unacceptable impact to nearby homes, there is no proposal for noise walls, nor any mitigation to individual homes.
- ⇒ Why are two different options being suggested for Haberfield? It is clear that both of these are unacceptable and will expose residents to unnecessary traffic danger, congestion and disruption with capacity to enjoy their homes and environment. It is insulting that the EIS acknowledges this but offers not solution other than to go ahead.
- ⇒ Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.
- ⇒ The EIS states that Darley Road is a contaminated site, likely including asbestos. There is a risk to the community associated with spoil removal, transfer and handling. We object to the selection of the site based on the environmental risks that this creates, along with risks to health of residents.
- ⇒ The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement may occur. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The EIS states that 'settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment'. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However,

some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres. This proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. In addition, the EIS states that there are a number of discrete areas to the north and northwest of the Rozelle Rail Yards, to the north of Campbell Road at St Peters and in the vicinity of Lord Street at Newtown where ground water movement above 20 milliliters is predicted 'strict limits on the degree of settlement permitted would be imposed on the project' and 'damage' would be rectified at no cost to the owner. would be placed (Executive Summary, xvii -iii). The project should not be permitted to be delivered in such a way that there is a known risk to property damage that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level of risk.

- ⇒ There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.
- ⇒ I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.
- ⇒ Permanent water treatment plant and substation – Leichhardt The proposal to locate this permanent structure in a residential setting is opposed. The site will have a negative visual impact on the area and is in direct line of sight of a number of homes. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site further from homes.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Christine Moffat

Signature: Moffat

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration : I HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 8 Gilpin St

Suburb: Camperdown Postcode: 2050

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- ◇ I am appalled that the Sydney Motorway Corporation could seek approval to build complex interchanges under the suburbs of Rozelle and Leichhardt on the basis of an EIS that is based on a concept design rather than detailed proposal that includes engineering plans.
- ◇ Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware and Enmore Roads and through the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.
- ◇ I am concerned that while hundreds of impacts on resident, including noise, loss of business, dust, and lost time through more traffic congestion, are identified in the EIS, the approach is always to recommend approval and promise vague 'mitigation' in the future. This is not good enough.
- ◇ The EIS indicates that 36 homes will have unacceptable noise impacts for extended periods at the Darley road construction site. The EIS does not mention the cumulative impact of aircraft noise in the Leichhardt or St Peters area, and therefore does not reflect the true impact of construction noise on the amenity of nearby residents and businesses. The noise impacts of construction are not able to be mitigated to an acceptable level and the EIS should not be approved on this basis.
- ◇ The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.
- ◇ Are there other potentially serious problems with Sydney Water utility services (described at EIS 12-57) or with other utilities in other suburbs or along the proposed M4-M5 tunnel alignment? If so, the EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these are all disclosed, researched, surveyed and the resolution publicly published.
- ◇ The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.
- ◇ I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Christine Moffat

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 8 Gilpin St

Suburb: Campdown Postcode: 2050

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- ◆ There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.
- ◆ The EIS currently permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the site (and based on experience with cars accessing the site for Dan Murphy's), queuing will be the norm and not the exception. The EIS needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads
- ◆ SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- ◆ The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.
- ◆ I object to the location of a permanent substation and water treatment plant following the completion of the project on the Darley Road site. This will limit the future uses of the land and the community has been continually assured that the land, which is Government-owned, would be available for community purposes. The presence of this facility will forever prevent the ability for safe and direct pedestrian access to the light rail stop, with users required to walk down a dark and winding path. It will also limit the future use of the site. If a permanent facility is to be located then it should be moved to the north of the site so that it is out of sight of homes and has less visual impact on residents.
- ◆ I am deeply disappointed that the EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain. This is a dangerous and reckless attempt to get approval for a project that is yet to be properly designed.
- ◆ I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Christine Moffat

eowyn2galadriel@yahoo.com.au

8 Gilpin St

Camperdown NSW 2050 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS tollroad proposal.

Global experience of major toll roads demonstrates that these projects are enormously expensive and counter-productive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity. It is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. The negative impacts on the health and well-being of local community's both in the construction and operation phases are unacceptable.

The fact that the State Government released this EIS just 2 weeks after submissions closed for comment on the M4-M5 Link Concept Design, undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

The impending sale of over 51% of WestConnex means that the government will transfer the whole of WestConnex and the construction of M4-M5 Link project completely into the hands of a private company which will not give adequate protections to the community.

In particular I object to the M4-M5 Link because:

- 1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.
- 2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.
- 3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.
- 4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.
- 5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.
- 6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.

Extra comments

WestConnex will be an additional burden to residents of suburbs which are already subjected to ongoing road and airplane noise and pollution. Modern, clean public transport would be cheaper and more effective.

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Christine Moffat

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

Suburb:

Postcode

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- a. I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. The government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.
- b. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters, Haberfield and Rozelle Interchanges will disrupt local transport networks including bus and active transport (walking and cycling).
- c. I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.
- d. Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.
- e. The Air quality data provided in the EIS is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.
- f. The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement
- g. Impacts not provided - Permanent water treatment plant and substation - The EIS states that there will be an office, worker parking and buildings to accommodate this facility on a permanent basis. It does not provide any detail as to - noise impacts, numbers of workers on site, any health risks associated with the facility. This is simply inadequate and the decision to locate this facility should be subject to a thorough assessment and approval process. It should not be approved as part of this EIS as there is simply no detail provided about the impact of this facility on the amenity of the area.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Enzo Legge

Signature: 

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 31 Abercrombie St

Suburb: Dulwich Hill Postcode 2203

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- ◆ The EIS states that Darley Road is a contaminated site, and likely has asbestos. The proposal is that 'treated' water will be directly discharged into the stormwater drain at Blackmore oval. There are four long-standing rowing clubs in the vicinity of this location. This plan will jeopardise the integrity of our waterway and compromise the use of the bay for recreational activities for boat and other users. We object in the strongest terms to this proposal on environmental and health reasons. There is no detail of the ongoing Motorway maintenance activities during operation provided in the EIS. The community therefore cannot comment on the impact that this ongoing facility will have on the locality. This component of the EIS should not be approved as this information is not provided and therefore impacts (on parking, safety, noise, amenity of the area) are not known.
 - ◆ It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle
 - ◆ The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.
 - ◆ Traffic diversions – Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction' (8-65). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents.
- Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.
- ◆ The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Amy Bashe

Signature:

AB

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

Balmain

Suburb:

Postcode

2041

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:


- I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project, There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Peters and Haberfield or Rozelle, all traffic going to the CBD, East or into the Inner West will use local roads.
- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. "..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval". It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a "review(ed) for consistency", and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie : the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)
- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
- Why is there no detailed information about the so called 'King Street Gateway' included in the EIS ?
- An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow 'swoosh' that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be 'encouraged' to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that 'definitive' rather than 'indicative' alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair 'definitive' document open for genuine public comment.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: GEORGIA WARD-FEAR

Signature: 

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 27 KUNDIBAR ST.

Suburb: BLACKHEATH Postcode: 2785

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- a. For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.
- b. Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates and unacceptable risk of damage to homes due to settlement (ground movement). The EIS acknowledges that at tunnelling at 35 metres and less this is a real risk. There is no mitigation provided for this risk. Instead, it states that properties will be repaired at the Government's expense. However no details or assurance as to how this will occur are provided. The project should not be approved with such tunnelling depths permitted and with no detail as to the extent of damage and how and when it will be repaired. It will lead to the situation where residents and businesses are forced to engage structural engineers and lawyers to prove that the damage was linked to Westconnex works, with no assurance that this property damage will be promptly and satisfactorily fixed.
- c. The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.
- d. Worker parking – Leichhardt. There is provision in the EIS for only a dozen worker car parks and no provision for the 100 or so workers who will be permanently based at the Darley Road site for up to five years. A major construction site project should not be permitted in a neighbourhood area without allocated parking for all workers. No other business would be permitted to be established without this requirement being satisfied – why is it acceptable for this project? In addition, the EIS proposes the removal of 20 car spaces used by residents on Darley Road and will remove the 'kiss and ride' facility at the light rail stop. This will result in residents being unable to park in their own street and will increase noise impacts from workers doing shift changeovers 24 hours a day.
- e. The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Larry DyerSignature: [Signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 1 COPELAND STREETSuburb: MEZANORIAPostcode 2150**I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:**

- The heritage impacts of WestCONnex Stage 3 need to be seen in the light of the appalling wholesale destruction that has already taken place in St Peters and Haberfield. Scores of houses and industrial buildings were torn down for tollways that will not solve traffic congestions. Always the cost of destruction is undervalued and the benefits of WestCONnex promoted. Whenever WestCONnex wants to tear down buildings or put them at risk it is backed by the EIS evaluation. This is not objective and it is not in the public interest.
- I object strongly to AECOM's approach to heritage. The methodology used is simply to describe heritage. If it interrupts the project plans, it simply must be destroyed. This is not an assessment at all. Plans to salvage items do have value but this value should not be used as a carrot to justify the removal of buildings.
- The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park, Rozelle, due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.
- There has never been any proper assessment of the cumulative impacts on heritage of the WestCONnex project. The loss of heritage in Concord, Haberfield and St Peters has been on a large scale and now the Stage 3 EIS

shows that the M4/M5 tunnel would further add to this loss.

- Heritage items - Camperdown. The EIS also acknowledges that the use of a rock-breaker at the outer extents of the project footprint will affect 73 residences, with five heritage items identified as having the potential to be within the 'minimum safe working distance'. While some mitigation 'considered', it is not mandated and the requirement to mitigate is limited to 'where feasible and reasonable'. The mitigation proposed seems in any event to comprise letter-boxing residents about the likely impacts! The protection of heritage items should be mandated, not just considered and there should be a strict requirement to protect such heritage items.
- I object to the assessment of the removal of buildings, other rail infrastructure and vegetation on the Rozelle Railway Yards being done in advance of this EIS. The RMS environmental assessment process is not publicly accountable. These works were part of the WestConnex project and should have been assessed as part of Stage 3.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application
#SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Cathiona Burgess

Signature: Burgess

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 47 Gornie St

Suburb: Newtown NSW Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- a. The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle.
 Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction.(Executive Summary xviii)
- b. 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective.
- c. Recently Andrew Constance has been quoted numerous times promoting his vision of the transport future and some of these views are aired in the EIS but the vision put forward is highly visionary with no practical detail addressing how these changes are going to be brought about and so they are totally unrealistic. For example it is starting to be commonly accepted that car manufacturers will be reducing production of petrol/diesel cars before 2040 probably starting in 2030. It is proposed that electric cars will then take over. It is suggested that cars will be charged over night at people's homes. Virtually no one in the Inner City Suburbs has a garage. Are all the streets throughout all the suburbs going to be fitted out with charging points outside all the houses, similar to parking meters? We have all watched the shambles of the rolling out of the NBN it would be mind blowing to watch what would happen with the rolling out of charging points to each household without a garage and it would take years to achieve. There are virtually no recharging points at any Fuel Stations anywhere as yet and to set these up will take years. A large part of the population run older cars, because that is all they are able to afford. It will take many years for these petrol/diesel cars to disappear. Andrew Constance has also said that when everyone is driving an autonomous car average speeds will be reduced but as they are not being controlled by individual drivers this will mean they will be able to travel much closer together and so there will not be so much delay caused by spread out congestion. If this is to be so perhaps the suggestion could be made that some mechanism could be employed which would enable these cars to link together; if that could be done then they could form -a TRAIN - and then really travel at speed!
- d. In the EIS the Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces for workers. There will be no car parking spaces at the Crescent Civil site. The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately 550. This means that there will be approximately 150 additional vehicles that will not be able to park in the Construction sites on a daily basis. The EIS suggests workers use public transport. If not, they will have to park on local streets in the area. Parking is already at a premium in the surrounding suburbs and is worsening all the time with the success of the Light Rail and out of area commuters daily leaving their cars at the light rail stops. It is totally unacceptable that the local streets accommodate constructors extra vehicles on a daily basis for the construction period of 5 years in an area where parking is already at a premium.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>ZACHARY LEWIS</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <i>9/15 BETTS ST LARRAMAH</i> Suburb: <i>LARRAMAH</i> ← Postcode <i>2150</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. Declaration: HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- ◇ The EIS states that 'reasonable and feasible work practices and mitigation measures would be implemented to minimise potential noise impacts due to activities occurring at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site.' 96-52) This is not good enough. The EIS does not contain any detail whatsoever of these proposal on which they can comment. In addition, there is no requirement that measures will in fact be introduced to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain detail of specific noise mitigation measures that are mandated and can be enforced.
- ◇ Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years. The EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.
- ◇ The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.
- ◇ Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.
- ◇ Heavy vehicle movements during peak hours – Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'reasonable and practical management strategies would be investigated to minimize the volume of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours.' (8-53). This is also not acceptable as it is not known what will actually be done to manage this impact. It is not good enough for the EIS, which forms the basis of the approval of this project, to simply mention 'investigations' and not detail a proper plan (on which residents can comment) on management of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours. In addition, Darley Road is very congested from 7am until 9.30am and then from 4pm-6.30pm, well outside the 'peak' periods identified in the EIS. And the impact on traffic will be caused by 'light' vehicles and not simply heavy vehicles. It is clear that there is no plan for managing these vehicle movements. The EIS should not be approved as drafted. It is unacceptable for this volume of vehicles to be proposed for this critical arterial road with no plan for management

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485


Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Clare Farnley

Signature:



Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

29 Kaye W, ave, Ashbury Hill

Suburb:

Dulwich Hill

Postcode

2203

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- a) The EIS needs to require that all workers are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads at the Darley Road site. This is justified because the site provides 11 car spaces for an estimated 100 workers a day on site. The project cannot be approved on this basis without a strict requirement on workers to use public transport or project provided transport and a prohibition needs to be in place against parking on local streets. The EIS needs to require that this restriction is included in all contracts and in the relevant approval documentation
- b) Traffic diversions – Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction' (8-65). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents. Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.
- c) The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Ramon Tavar

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 2 Ryde Road

Suburb: Hunter's Hill Postcode: 2110

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- ◆ It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area, Rozelle
- ◆ The EIS states that after the M4-m5 opens, that traffic on Darley Road will increase by 4%. There is no benefit in the overall project for residents. During construction westbound traffic will increase on Darley Road by 37%. This increase in traffic for a period of up to five years will make it hazardous to cross the road and access the light rail and travel to Blackmore oval, the bat run, the dog park and the Leichhardt pool. In addition, it will drastically increase both local traffic and outer area traffic at peak commute times. We therefore object to the location of this site based on the unacceptable traffic impacts it will have on road users and on residents.
- ◆ It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.
- ◆ The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.
- ◆ Flooding – Leichhardt. Darley Road and adjacent streets such as Hubert St are exposed to flood. The flood impact could be exacerbated by the disruption or blockage of existing drainage networks, which are risks identified in the EIS. The EIS has not assessed whether the identified risk to the existing drainage network will cause increased risk of flood damage to flood lots and it fails to take account of the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan which contains recommended flood modification options. The EIS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM3 to lay additional pipes/culverts from Elswick Street to Hawthorne Canal (via Regent Street and Darley Road). RMS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM4 to lay additional pipes/ culverts from William Street to Hawthorne Canal via Hubert Street and Darley Road. The EIS should not be approved as it has not properly explained or assessed these impacts.
- ◆ Discharge of water into storm water at Blackmore Oval – Leichhardt The permanent substation and water treatment plant proposed for the Darley Road site facility should not be approved as part of the EIS. It proposes discharging water from the tunnels into the storm water canal near Blackmore Oval. This will devastate our waterways and impact negatively on the amenity of the bay which has four rowing clubs in close proximity. In addition, the environmental impacts of this discharge are not properly set out in the EIS.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>V. Benthley</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>25/1 Goodsell St</u>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <u>St Peters</u>	Postcode
	Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.
- Why are two different options being suggested for Haberfield? It is clear that both of these are unacceptable and will expose residents to unnecessary traffic danger, congestion and disruption with capacity to enjoy their homes and environment. It is insulting that the EIS acknowledges this but offers not solution other than to go ahead.
- I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.
- The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.
- Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.
- It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area, Rozelle
- Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.
- A lot of work has gone into building cycling and pedestrian routes in Rozelle and Annandale. Interference and disruption of routes for four years is not a 'temporary' imposition.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Jessica Campbell</i>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <i>1/8 Cavendish</i>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <i>Enmore</i>	Postcode <i>2042</i>
Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>		
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years		

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- I. *I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.*
- II. *The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.*
- III. *The business case for the project in all three stages has failed to taken into account the external costs of these massive road projects in air pollution for human and environmental health, in adding fossil fuel emissions to increase global warming effects, and in the economic and social costs of the disruption to human activities, of displacement of people and businesses and of the destruction of community cohesion and amenity. These external costs far outweigh any benefits from building roads which poorly serve people's transport needs but instead enrich private corporations.*
- IV. *The EIS lacks sufficient focus on traffic congestion in the suburbs of Alexandria and Erskineville. Are these being ignored because they will be even more congested than currently.*
- V. *The EIS states that, if the current proposal for ventilation facilities do not manage to achieve satisfactory environmental and health impacts, that further ventilation facilities may be proposed. This is unacceptable and the EIS does not provide the alternative locations for any such facilities and therefore the community is deprived of any opportunity to comment on their impacts. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be additional ventilation facilities that are not disclosed in the EIS.*
- VI. *It is clear that the tunnel portals will be major sites for more traffic congestion. Some intersections that are currently very congested will be just as bad in 2033.*
- VII. *Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years. The EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.*
- VIII. *The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.*

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Grace</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>5 Albert Rd.</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Strathfield</u> Postcode: <u>2135</u>	

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application.**

- i. The site should be returned to the community as compensation for the imposition of this construction site in our neighbourhood for a 5 year period. If the substation and water treatment plant is moved to the north of the site, then the lower half of the site (which is the most accessible end) could be converted into open space with mature trees planted. As this site is immediately adjacent to the bay run, bicycle parking and other facilities that support active transport could be included. This would result increase the green space for residents and result in a pleasant green environment for pedestrians, rather than a fenced facility.
- ii. Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects ?
- iii. I am concerned that the AECOM, the company responsible for the EIS, always approves knocking down heritage buildings if the project requires it. It doesn't how much value it holds for the community, it must always be destroyed.
- iv. No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents to not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
- v. The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.
- vi. I oppose the destruction of any more of Sydney's heritage for WestCONnex. I am appalled that Sydney Motorway Corporation is seeking approval to tunnel under hundreds of highly valued heritage buildings in Newtown without any serious assessment of risk at all. This heritage belongs to all of Sydney.
- vii. A lot of work has gone into building cycling and pedestrian routes in Rozelle and Annandale. Interference and disruption of routes for four years is not a 'temporary' imposition.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: MIRIAM NIOS

Signature: 

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 3115 Hemmigham St

Suburb: Enmore

Postcode 2048

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:


- A. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. We now have proposals for Stages 1,2 and 3 and none achieve this goal. The community is asked to support this proposal on the basis of other major unfunded projects, which are little more than ideas on a map. This is NOT the way to plan a liveable city
- B. No noise barriers have been proposed. This is unacceptable and appropriate noise barriers should be included in the EIS for consideration. (Executive Summary xvii)
- C. The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' Therefore this entire process is a sham as the extent to which concerns are taken into account is not known as the contractor can simply make further changes. As the contractor is not bound to take into account community impacts outside of the strict requirements and as the contractor will be trying to deliver the project as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is likely that the additional measure proposed with respect to construction noise mitigation for (example) will not be adopted. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS is riddled with caveats and lacks clear obligations and requirements for project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail.
- D. There has been no 'meaningful' consultation with the community. Some areas affected by M3/M5 have not even been letterboxed by SMC. These include St Peters and sections of Erskineville. The SMC received hundreds of submissions on its concept design and failed to respond to any of these before lodging this EIS.
- E. The EIS at 12-57 describes potentially serious problems where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs. Why is SMC proposing tunnelling within metres of these critical services when no accurate surveying has been done? And when there is only limited information available about the strength of these water tunnels? The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Maïe-Rue Paterson

Signature: 

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 50 Florence Street

Suburb: ST PETERS Postcode: 2044

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.
- Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.
- I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.
- Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.
- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.
- The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.
- The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>M. ARIK LAGLANO</u>
	Address: <u>56 Pacific Cr</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Malabar</u> Postcode <u>2230</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- a. I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.
- b. I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.
- c. Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)
- d. Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. There is however a caveat – the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.
- e. I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.
- f. I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # 8507485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Paul Brown

Signature: [Signature]

Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 71 St Georges Ave

Suburb: Drumoyne Postcode: 2047

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- ✚ The EIS at 12-57 describes potentially serious problems where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs. Why is SMC proposing tunnelling within metres of these critical services when no accurate surveying has been done? And when there is only limited information available about the strength of these water tunnels? The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- ✚ Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects?
- ✚ There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.
- ✚ I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.
- ✚ SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- ✚ Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware and Enmore Roads and through the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.
- ✚ EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the Process for addressing project uncertainties. "The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in Chapter 1, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval". The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.
- ✚ I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.
- ✚ Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex, yet there are no detailed construction plans. It is not enough to say there will be mitigation if negative impacts unfold. An EIS should assess risks and be able to predict whether they are worth risking and if so, what mitigation should be necessary.
- ✚ The assessment and solution to potentially serious problems described in the EIS at 12-57 (where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs) is "based on assumptions about the strength and stiffness of the water tunnels given that limited information about the design and condition of these assets was available. Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water assets. A detailed assessment would be carried out in consultation with Sydney Water to demonstrate that construction of the M4-M5 Link tunnels would have negligible adverse settlement or vibration impacts on these tunnels. A settlement monitoring program would also be implemented during construction to validate or reassess the predictions should it be required." The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

From: Paul Brown <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Monday, 16 October 2017 6:22 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS.

NSW Planning should recommend a halt to the planning process and an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged. Residents all over Sydney, experts, Councillors and even potential investors have all queried the information supplied by the Sydney Motorway Corporation and NSW Roads and Maritime Services. In this situation, it would be unprofessional of NSW Planning to rubber stamp this inadequate document.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. Key decisions have been left open in this EIS. Not to allow consultation on the final choice of construction sites would further compromise an already inadequate consultation process.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is extremely superficial and fails to come to grips with debates in the field of transport planning. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS. The SMC should be required to engage with this plan and to respond to it. Any responsible system of planning governance would require that.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. NSW RMS is currently reviewing this policy. A draft of this review should be published for public comment before this planning process is completed

With four unfiltered emissions stacks in Rozelle, two in Haberfield (one each for the M4East and New M5) and two in St Peters, along with a large number of exit portals, residents of these area will suffer greatly from direct exposure to poisonous diesel particulates.

This is negligent when you consider that the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic.

I am also very concerned about the impact of WestConnex on that residents and workers living near local roads which become even more congested as a result of WestConnex. There is research evidence that it is dangerous to live close to congested roads. I reject an approach to transport planning which allows a government authority to approve a project knowing that it will place some residents at increased risk of life threatening impacts.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. City of Sydney experts and other academic experts have already rejected the traffic analysis on which WestConnex bases its case. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. They are arguing that due to toll avoidance and the opening of Badgery's Creek airport, the actual traffic figures will be lower than predicted. In this situation, it would be negligent for NSW Planning to approve this project.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed. It would also be absurd to place conditions on a project for which even the most basic details are not known.

I also object to a project which will add to congestion on local roads in the Alexandria, Newtown, Enmore and Erskineville areas. The EIS does not adequately model the impact on local roads of Stage 3. I am concerned that the final result will be that King Street will become a 24 hour clearway, which would kill a vibrant Sydney area.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a drive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

I am also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model's margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

The Social and Economic Impacts report refers to the socio-economic impact of tolls on Sydney communities. Toll avoidance would be a major impact of this project. The investigation and analysis of the impact of tolls is not adequate and underestimates the social, economic and health burden it will place on residents for decades to come.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.

It was promised, and was a condition of the M4 East approval that in 2019, all Haberfield and Ashfield above ground WestConnex construction sites were to have been dismantled, as well the Urban Design and Landscape Plan (UDLP) completed and Legacy Project 'surplus lands and property' delivered back to the community. These promises were still being reiterated in early 2017, when there was community consultation on how surplus land would be restored to the community in 2019. It is a matter of grave concern that these promises are now been ignored as if they did not happen. NSW Planning should investigate this situation.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks. I am completely opposed to the residents of St Peters being exposed to a high risk of being impacted by gases from exposed landfill for a further three years. The NSW EPA should not grant any further licenses that would allow such events to occur.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

The heritage report ignores potential impacts on hundreds of homes in Newtown and Rozelle which are part of Sydney's valued history. This report is incomplete and should not be accepted. Given that the EIS acknowledges that buildings can be damaged by tunnelling, there should have been a full report on all heritage buildings within the tunnel project boundaries.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, and 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.

Please act in the community's interests, not the developer's.

Yours sincerely, Paul Brown 71 St Georges Cres, Drummoyne NSW 2047, Australia

This email was sent by Paul Brown via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Paul provided an email address (bangalow10@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Paul Brown at bangalow10@gmail.com.

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

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Sarah Hall

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 358 Victoria Rd

Suburb: Marriedville Postcode: 2204

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The Concept Design was a woefully inadequate document totally devoid of any real depth of detail in terms of maps, scales, distances with only vague suggestions and glamorized Artist's Impressions of an idealized view of what Stage 3 would be like. It was another example of current city planning documents that consistently accentuate huge areas of tranquil green spaces with families and children out walking and riding bicycles in idealized parks and suburbs. All this is total PR spin and bears no reality about the real outcome of the build. It bears no reality as to what Stage 3 of Westconnex will be like.
- The City West Link Eastbound AM and PM peak hour and other locations. "Table 7-19 shows that several locations are forecast to exceed theoretical roadway capacity with the increased background traffic and the construction traffic in the 2021 AM and PM peak hours. However, traffic on the majority of these roads would exceed their theoretical capacity even without the construction traffic, simply due to the growth in background traffic". So in the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, massive amounts of construction traffic are going to be added for the whole construction period of 5 years. Even on completion it is stated in the EIS that traffic will be worse in this area than 'without the project'. This categorically shows that the planning of Westconnex is totally inadequate and needs major changes. It also shows that when completed Westconnex will not work. It is abundantly obvious that Rail/Metro is the only option to radically overhaul Sydney's failed transport systems
- The Health costs of outdoor Air Pollution in Australia are up to \$8.4 Billion a year. The Health costs of Particulate Pollution in the Sydney Greater Metropolitan area is around \$4.7 Billion a year. With no filtration on the Westconnex tunnels these Health costs will rise substantially.
- Along with the widening of the Crescent at Annandale the White's Creek bridge is to be rebuilt. This will mean that the road in this area will be reduced in width as first one side of the bridge is rebuilt followed by the other. Added to the additional volume of trucks from the Rozelle Rail Yards, the Crescent Civil site and the Camperdown site this is going to lead to massive congestion on Johnston St and all along the Crescent towards Ross St and make it virtually impossible for residents to exit and return to their local area. It is most likely that the commercial sectors of the Tramsheds development will be badly affected.
- Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution— most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a massive number of extra truck movements and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times.
- Motor vehicles account for 14% of Particulate Pollution of 2.5 microns and less in Australia. There is no safe level to exposure to particulate matter of 2.5 microns and less. Particulate matter is linked with Asthma, Lung Disease, Cancer and Stroke.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: DANIEL MA
	Address: 19 CRESCENT ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: ROZELLE Postcode 2039
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Daniel Ma
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The Air quality data provided in the EIS is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.
- I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.
- The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.
- The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction.(Executive Summary xviii)
- The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.
- The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)
- A lot of work has gone into building cycling and pedestrian routes in Rozelle and Annandale. Interference and disruption of routes for four years is not a 'temporary' imposition.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: DANIEL MA	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: 19 CRESCENT ST	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: ROZELLE	Postcode 2039
Signature: Daniel Ma		
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.
2. Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.
3. I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.
4. Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.
5. There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.
6. The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.
7. The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONNex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

From: Daniel Ma <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 7:11 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a drive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the

compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model's margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for

residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, 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, Daniel Ma 19 Crescent St Rozelle

This email was sent by Daniel Ma via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Daniel provided an email address (dannyma@iinet.net.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Daniel Ma at dannyma@iinet.net.au.

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

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Monique Aryal

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

31a James St

Suburb:

Enmore

Postcode

2042

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project, There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Peters and Haberfield or Rozelle, all traffic going to the CBD, East or into the Inner West will use local roads.
- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. "..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval". It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a "review(ed) for consistency", and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie : the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)
- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
- Why is there no detailed information about the so called 'King Street Gateway' included in the EIS ?
- An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow 'swoosh' that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be 'encouraged' to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that 'definitive' rather than 'indicative' alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair 'definitive' document open for genuine public comment.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Geoff. Perweré

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 44 Malcolm St

Suburb: Erskineville Postcode: 2043

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments


Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- 1) The EIS states that there may be a 'small increase in pollutant concentrations' near surface roads. The EIS states that potential health impacts associated with changes in air quality (specifically nitrogen dioxide and particulates) within the local community have been assessed and are considered to be 'acceptable.' We disagree that the impacts on human health are acceptable and object to the project in its entirety because of these impacts.
- 2) There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.
- 3) The EIS currently permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the site (and based on experience with cars accessing the site for Dan Murphy's), queuing will be the norm and not the exception. The EIS needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads
- 4) The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.
- 5) I object to the location of a permanent substation and water treatment plant following the completion of the project on the Darley Road site. This will limit the future uses of the land and the community has been continually assured that the land, which is Government-owned, would be available for community purposes. The presence of this facility will forever prevent the ability for safe and direct pedestrian access to the light rail stop, with users required to walk down a dark and winding path. It will also limit the future use of the site. If a permanent facility is to be located then it should be moved to the north of the site so that it is out of sight of homes and has less visual impact on residents.
- 6) The EIS states that there are 'investigations' occurring into alternative access to the Darley Road site. The EIS does not provide any detail on which residents can comment about alternative access which would keep trucks off Darley Road. No spoil truck movements should be permitted on Darley Road and the plans for alternative access should be expedited. It should be a condition of approval that the alternative access is confirmed and that no spoil trucks are permitted to access Darley Road due to the unacceptable noise, safety and traffic issues that the current proposal creates

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment Application Number: SSI 7485 GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	From: Name: <i>ANTO HEARNES</i>  Address: <i>139 STATION STREET</i>
Application Name: Westconnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <i>NEWTOWN</i> Postcode <i>2049</i>
Declaration : I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

I object to the whole of the Westconnex Project, including the Westconnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS, for the following reasons :

- The NSW government stated that WestCONnex would NOT mean clearways for King St Newtown. Less than a week after the release of the EIS weekend clearways for King St have already been announced. I am completely opposed to Clearways as everyone knows that they would kill off Newtown that is valued by people throughout Sydney as a retail and social hub.
- The EIS includes no serious analysis of the impacts of WestConnex M4M5 on Erskineville, Mitchell or Edgeware Rds. These roads will be flooded with traffic coming out of the St Peters Interchange.
- The WestConnex Traffic model should be released to Councils and the public so that it can be independently reviewed and tested.
- According to the EIS, traffic around the St Peters Interchange will be highly congested in 2033. Why would anyone approve a project costing billions of dollars to produce more traffic congestion?
- There has been no serious assessment of the impacts on very old houses in Newtown sustaining weeks of tunneling and vibration. At some points in South Newtown and St Peters this tunneling will be only 15 metres below ground level.
- The EIS expects "construction fatigue" (its euphemism for unacceptable noise and pollution in our homes) to continue for at least another 5 years. I am opposed to five more years of noise and dust from construction in St Peters and Haberfield.
- I am angry that there was so little consultation in Newtown during the community feedback period. Many residents near the tunnel were not notified at all about the potential impacts of the project on them.
- Parents and Students at Newtown Public and Newtown Performing High School have not been sufficiently consulted about this project.
- The EIS states that the route is indicative only. This is completely unacceptable to me. This means that if there are changes, residents who are impacted will have no right to public feedback.
- I am very concerned that privatisation of WestConnex will mean that the contractors are even less accountable than they are currently. Who will hold the contractors accountable?
- I am opposed to the M4/M5Link project being proposed **let alone approved** when its "success" depends on the construction of the Western Harbour Tunnel AND the F6, neither of which even planned.
- I am opposed to construction happening so close to childcare centres anywhere, including in Lilyfield and Rozelle.
- The EIS does not sufficiently take into account the impact of decades of tolls on Western Sydney.
- The EIS ignores the horrific impacts of the New M5 and M4 East and thereby fails to take account of cumulative impacts.
- The EIS is not up to date with its analysis of modes of transport and underestimates the growing preference for public transport.

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Sarah ClarkeSignature: [Signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 22 Denison StSuburb: Arncliffe Postcode: 2205

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.
- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.
- 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.
- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used. The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.
- I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>SANDRA LANGTREE</u>
	Address: <u>49/73 White Street</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Lilyfield</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.
- Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.
- I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.
- Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.
- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.
- The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.
- The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Application Number: SSI 7485 Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Name: <u>Peter Strong</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: <u>22 Denison St</u> Suburb: <u>Arncliffe</u> Postcode <u>2205</u>
--	--

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:


- i. The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.
- ii. In Leichhardt serious safety concerns about the choice of the Darley Rd site have been raised by the Inner West Council and an independent engineer's report. Despite countless meetings between local residents and SMC and RMS over 12 months, none of the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents have even been acknowledged. This is a massive breach of community trust and seriously questions the integrity of the EIS.
- iii. The RMS has previously identified the Darley Rd site in Leichhardt as the third most dangerous traffic hazard in the Inner West. The NSW Land and

Environment Court found that the location of the site couldn't safely deal with 60 bottle truck movements a week, but the M4/M5 EIS shows that more than 800 vehicles including hundreds of heavy ones will use the site each day as part of construction of M4M5 Link. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why are the already acknowledged impacts being ignored.

- iv. It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.
- v. The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. In relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.
- vi. EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____


Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Peter Strong</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: 	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
<small>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</small>	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>22 Denison St</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Arcliffe</u> Postcode: <u>NSW 2205</u>	

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.
- In Leichhardt serious safety concerns about the choice of the Darley Rd site have been raised by the Inner West Council and an independent engineer's report. Despite countless meetings between local residents and SMC and RMS over 12 months, none of the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents have even been acknowledged. This is a massive breach of community trust and seriously questions the integrity of the EIS.
- The RMS has previously identified the Darley Rd site in Leichhardt as the third most dangerous traffic hazard in the Inner West. The NSW Land and Environment Court found that the location of the site couldn't safely deal with 60 bottle truck movements a week, but the M4/M5 EIS shows that more than 800 vehicles including hundreds of heavy ones will use the site each day as part of construction of M4M5 Link. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why are the already acknowledged impacts being ignored.
- It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.
- The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. In relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.
- EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____


<p>Attention Director Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Peter Strong</u></p> <p>Signature: <u></u></p> <p><small>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</small></p> <p>Address: <u>22 Denison St</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Arncliffe</u> Postcode: <u>2205</u></p>
---	--

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>A. The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement</p> <p>B. The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.</p> <p>C. The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.</p> <p>D. The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give</p> | <p>feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.</p> <p>E. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.</p> <p>F. Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downplays concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. The raises the question of whether this is a result of the failure of SMC to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters about the potential impacts of the M4 M5</p> <p>G. The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.</p> |
|---|---|

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Peter Strong</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: 	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>22 Denison St</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Arncliffe</u> Postcode: <u>NSW 2205</u>	

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- A. THE LATEST EIS WAS RELEASED JUST TEN BUSINESS DAYS AFTER FEEDBACK PERIOD ENDED FOR THE CONCEPT DESIGN FOR THE M4/M5 AND BEFORE PRELIMINARY DRILLING TO ESTABLISH A ROUTE THROUGH THE INNER WEST IS COMPLETED. WHAT IS THE RUSH? THIS EIS IS LITTLE MORE THAN A CONCEPT DESIGN AND IS FAR LESS DEVELOPED THAN EARLIER ONES. IT IS COMPOSED OF MANY INDICATE ONLY PLANS SUCH THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO KNOW WHAT THE IMPACTS WILL BE AND YET APPROVAL IS BEING SOUGHT IN A RUSH. THE EIS IGNORES MORE THAN 1500 SUBMISSIONS, INCLUDING ONE OF 142 PAGES FROM THE INNER WEST COUNCIL.
- B. ONE TOLL ROAD LEADS TO ANOTHER 3 BEING PROPOSED. THE EIS'S FOR THE M4 EAST AND THE NEW M5 ARGUED THE CASE THAT SERIOUS CONGESTION CREATED NEAR INTERCHANGES WOULD BE SOLVED ONCE THE M4/M5 WAS BUILT. NOW IT SEEMS THIS IS NOT THE CASE AND MORE ROADS WILL BE NEEDED TO RELIEVE THE CONGESTION – WHERE DOES THIS END? ACCORDING TO THE M4/M5 EIS THE REAL BENEFITS WILL DEPEND ON BUILDING THE WESTERN HARBOUR TUNNEL, THE AIRPORT LINK AND A TOLLWAY HEADING SOUTH. NONE OF THESE PROJECTS HAVE BEEN PLANNED, LET ALONE APPROVED BUT YET ARE PART OF ADDRESSING THE CONGESTION IMPACTS ACKNOWLEDGED FOR THE M4/M5 LINK PROJECT. GIVEN THIS HOW IS IT POSSIBLE TO KNOW OR ADDRESS THE IMPACTS OF THE M4/M5 LINK, UNLESS THIS IS JUST YET MORE JUSTIFICATION FOR YET MORE ROADS?
- C. RESEARCH ABOUT ROADS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATES THAT ROADS CREATE CONGESTION. THE WESTCONNEX PROJECT IS NO DIFFERENT AND THE EIS CLEARLY INDICATES THAT THIS IS AN IMPACT OF THE M4/M5 AND THE CONSEQUENT ROADS THAT WILL FOLLOW. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE M4/M5 LINK EIS ITSELF INDICATES THE RMS IS ALREADY HARD AT WORK CONSIDERING HOW TO SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS – OF CONGESTION CAUSED BY ROADS.
- D. WHERE IS THE COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND TO LONG TERM PLANNING WHEN THE EIS FOR THE M4/M5 LINK IS RELEASED BEFORE ANY RESPONSE TO THE EXTENSIVE COMMUNITY FEEDBACK ON THE M4-M5 LINK CONCEPT DESIGN COULD POSSIBLY HAVE BEEN SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED. THIS DEMONSTRATES DEEP GOVERNMENT CONTEMPT FOR THE PEOPLE OF NSW AND THE COMMUNITIES OF THE INNER WEST OF SYDNEY IN PARTICULAR.
- E. THE EIS WAS PREPARED BY GLOBAL ENGINEERING FIRM AECOM, WHICH ALSO PREPARED THE EIS FOR STAGES 1 AND 2. WHEN HE APPROVED THESE EARLIER STAGES, THE THEN MINISTER FOR PLANNING ROB STOKES POINTED TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THAT WOULD MINIMISE IMPACTS ON COMMUNITIES. BUT THE IMPACTS HAVE TURNED OUT TO WORSE THAN EXPECTED.
- F. FOR EXAMPLE, THE AECOM EIS FOR THE NEW M5 FAILED TO DEAL WITH HOW THE MASSIVELY CONTAMINATED LAND FILL AT ALEXANDRIA WOULD BE MANAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION. AFTER MONTHS OF SICKENING ODOURS, THE NSW EPA ADMITS THAT DESPITE FINING SMC AND REQUIRING CONTRACTORS TO TAKE MEASURES TO CONTROL ODOURS, THEY HAVE NOT STOPPED. IT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT IT DOES NOT HAVE THE POWER TO STOP WORK UNTIL WESTCONNEX CONTRACTORS COMPLY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: PETER ROSS

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 16 BROWN ST

Suburb: ST PETERS NSW Postcode 2044

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

I. (6-51) The EIS needs to mandate that these measures are in place. Where mentioned, the acoustic shed that is considered offers the lower grade noise protection. This is despite the fact that 36 'sensitive receivers' are identified in the EIS, who will have extreme noise disturbance through much of the 5-year construction period. In addition, the acoustic shed covers only the spoil and spoil handling area and not the tunnel entrances and exits. The highest level of noise protection, which is only suggested in the EIS, needs to be mandated in the EIS. In addition, the shed needs to cover both the entrance and exit to the site and not simply the spoil handling areas. The independent engineer's report (commissioned by the Inner West council) states that it is likely, because of the elevated position of the site, that it is likely an acoustic shed will not contain the noise to an acceptable level. In addition, a temporary access tunnel will be built from the top of the site and run directly under homes in James Street. These homes will be unacceptably impacted by the construction noise and truck movements without these additional measures

II. I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.

III. The EIS states that these will occur near the Darley Road site. There is no detail provided, nor is there a process by which residents can influence such

decisions. The Inner West Council's documents state that Darley Road is not built to normal road requirements and safety standards, as it was established as an access road for the former goods line. Two fatalities have occurred near the site location, with many accidents. The Council has been trying to make Darley Road a safer route for many years. Elwick Street North for example was partially closed as a result of a fatality. The approval conditions need to make it clear that all road closures need to be made in consultation with residents affected and that the safety issues are adequately addressed. No arterial traffic from Darley Road should be allowed to be diverted onto narrow local roads

IV. The proposed work hours for the Rozelle Rail Yards are tunnelling and spoil handling 24 hours a day seven days a week. Civil construction Mon - Fri 7.00am - 6.00pm, Sat 8.00am - 1.00 pm. There will be no night work at The Crescent Civil Site and the daytime hours are stated to be the same as at the Rozelle Rail Yards. However as has been experienced by those at Haberfield and St Peters these hours and especially late and night work have been extended and implemented when the schedule has fallen behind and this has lead to physical and mental stress for many residents through interrupted sleep and loss of sleep especially with children. The roads and sites at night in the area will see a marked increase in noise from truck movements, truck reversing alarms and running machinery. It will also see a marked increase in light during the night hours with site illumination and vehicle head lights as has been experienced in other areas. These problems have not been properly addressed and are not adequately dealt with in the EIS.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: PETER ROSS

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 16 BROWN ST

Suburb: ST PETERS NSW Postcode: 2044

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- a. For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.
- b. Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates and unacceptable risk of damage to homes due to settlement (ground movement). The EIS acknowledges that at tunnelling at 35 metres and less this is a real risk. There is no mitigation provided for this risk. Instead, it states that properties will be repaired at the Government's expense. However no details or assurance as to how this will occur are provided. The project should not be approved with such tunnelling depths permitted and with no detail as to the extent of damage and how and when it will be repaired. It will lead to the situation where residents and businesses are forced to engage structural engineers and lawyers to prove that the damage was linked to Westconnex works, with no assurance that this property damage will be promptly and satisfactorily fixed.
- c. The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.
- d. Worker parking – Leichhardt. There is provision in the EIS for only a dozen worker car parks and no provision for the 100 or so workers who will be permanently based at the Darley Road site for up to five years. A major construction site project should not be permitted in a neighbourhood area without allocated parking for all workers. No other business would be permitted to be established without this requirement being satisfied – why is it acceptable for this project? In addition, the EIS proposes the removal of 20 car spaces used by residents on Darley Road and will remove the 'kiss and ride' facility at the light rail stop. This will result in residents being unable to park in their own street and will increase noise impacts from workers doing shift changeovers 24 hours a day.
- e. The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties


Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: PETER ROSSSignature: 

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 16 BROWN STSuburb: ST PETERSPostcode 2044**I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:**

- a) The EIS needs to require that all workers are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads at the Darley Road site. This is justified because the site provides 11 car spaces for an estimated 100 workers a day on site. The project cannot be approved on this basis without a strict requirement on workers to use public transport or project provided transport and a prohibition needs to be in place against parking on local streets. The EIS needs to require that this restriction is included in all contracts and in the relevant approval documentation
- b) Traffic diversions – Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction' (8-65). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents. Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.
- c) The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Peter Ross

p.ross@unsw.edu.au

16 Brown St

St Peters NSW 2044 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS tollroad proposal.

Global experience of major toll roads demonstrates that these projects are enormously expensive and counter-productive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity. It is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. The negative impacts on the health and well-being of local community's both in the construction and operation phases are unacceptable.

The fact that the State Government released this EIS just 2 weeks after submissions closed for comment on the M4-M5 Link Concept Design, undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

The impending sale of over 51% of WestConnex means that the government will transfer the whole of WestConnex and the construction of M4-M5 Link project completely into the hands of a private company which will not give adequate protections to the community.

In particular I object to the M4-M5 Link because:

- 1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.
- 2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.
- 3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.
- 4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.
- 5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.
- 6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.

Extra comments

The EIS is shoddy, to say the least. The authors themselves say it's 'indicative'. This is yet further evidence that the whole WestConnex project and the way it's been foisted onto Sydneysiders is a confidence trick. For years, now, we've had to endure lies, and phoney claims that the organisation has consulted citizens.

None of the many consultations I've attended have been true consultations. They have been tick the box exercises.

This EIS is the latest example of these sham consultations. I worry about the health of people that will be affected by increased noise and air pollution.

The project is not even going to filter the exhaust stacks even when they are situated near schools. I could go on but what's the point.

The government will continue to funnel our public money into the pockets of private, already wealthy, individuals. Greed knows no bounds. Our health and well being suffer.

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Ross

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: PETER ROSS

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 16 BROWN ST

Suburb: ST PETERS NSW Postcode: 2044

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link


- I. Permanent water treatment plant and substation – Leichhardt The proposal to locate this permanent structure in a residential setting is opposed. The site will have a negative visual impact on the area and is in direct line of sight of a number of homes. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site further from homes.
- II. The assessment and solution to potentially serious problems described in the EIS at 12-57 (where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs) is "based on assumptions about the strength and stiffness of the water tunnels given that limited information about the design and condition of these assets was available. Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water assets. A detailed assessment would be carried out in consultation with Sydney Water to demonstrate that construction of the M4-M5 Link tunnels would have negligible adverse settlement or vibration impacts on these tunnels. A settlement monitoring program would also be implemented during construction to validate or reassess the predictions should it be required." The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- III. The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.
- IV. Because this is still based on a "concept design" it is unknown how the communities affected will not know what is being done below their residences, schools, business premises and public spaces, particularly if the whole project is sold into a private corporation's ownership before the actual designs and construction plans are determined. The EIS makes references to these designs and plans being reviewed but there is **NO** information as to what agency will be responsible for such reviews or whether the outcomes of such reviews will be made public. The communities below whose homes, business premises, public buildings and public spaces this massive project will be excavated and built will be completely in the dark about what is being done, what standards it is supposed to comply with, what inspection or scrutiny it will subject to, and whether the private corporations undertaking the work will be held to any liability by our government.
- V. The EIS uses maps indicating alignment of the mainline tunnels. It is clear from more detailed reading deep into the EIS (ie 12-57 Sydney Water Tunnels) that the alignment and depths of the tunnels may vary very significantly, after further survey work has been done and construction methodology determined by the construction contractor. The maps provided in the EIS are nothing more than 'indicative' and are misleading the community. The EIS should be withdrawn, corrected and updated, and reissued for genuine public comment based on 'definitive' information.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: PETER ROSS

Signature: 

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 16 BROWN ST

Suburb: ST PETERS NSW Postcode 2044

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments


Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- A. Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces provided for workers(EiS). The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately 550. This means that 150 vehicles will need to park in nearby local streets which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.
- B. There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.
- C. There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be date. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.
- D. EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.
- E. SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- F. I am deeply disappointed that the EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain. This is a dangerous and reckless attempt to get approval for a project that is yet to be properly designed.
- G. I strongly object to the proposed location of this permanent operational facility on Darley Road. The presence of this site contradicts repeated assurances to the community that the site would be returned after construction was completed. The ongoing presence of this site will limit future uses of the darley Road site which could serve community purposes, particularly given its location directly next to public transport. Its presence removes the ability to provide more accessible, safer and direct pedestrian access to the North Leichhardt Light Rail Station. The plant location, in a neighbourhood setting is not appropriate. It will reduce property values and have an unacceptable impacts on the visual amenity of the area. The streets adjacent to Darley Road are comprised of low-rise residential homes and small businesses and infrastructure such as this should not be permitted in such a location.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____


Submission from:	Submission to:
Name:.....PETER ROSS	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature:..... 	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: 16 BROWN ST	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: ST PETERS NSW Postcode: 2044	

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application.**

- i. Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downplays concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. The raises the question of whether this is a result of the failure of SMC to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters about the potential impacts of the M4 M5
- ii. The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.
- iii. I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.
- iv. I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.
- v. The EIS acknowledges that extra construction traffic will add to travel times across the Inner West and have a negative impact on businesses in the area. No compensation is suggested. These impacts are not been taken into account of evaluating the cost of WestCONNex.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: PETER ROSS Signature: 
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: 16 BROWN ST Suburb: ST PETERS Postcode 2044

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>I. The EIS does not provide appropriate parking for the estimated 100 or so workers that the EIS states will work every day at the site, while other equivalent sites have allocated parking for such workers (Northcote Civil site (150)) and Parramatta Road East Civil site (140). It is also noted that the EIS provides for loss of 20 residential parks on Darley Road. Local streets are at capacity already because of the lack of off-street parking for many residents and the Light Rail stop which means that commuters use local streets. The EIS states that workers 'will be encouraged to use public transport.' the EIS needs to mandate that no trucks or construction vehicles are to park in local streets. There needs to be a requirement that is enforceable that workers use the Light Rail stop which is adjacent to the site or a plan to bus in workers</p> <p>II. The EIS does not require an acoustic shed and states that 'Acoustic barriers and devices at the access tunnel entrances would be considered and implemented where reasonable and feasible to minimise potential noise impacts associated with out-of-hours works within the tunnels.'</p> <p>III. The EIS contains no detail of the access tunnel from the Darley Road site to the mainline tunnel other than depicting the route. The approval conditions need to ensure that tunnelling is occurring at sufficient depth so as to not jeopardise the integrity of the homes and not create unacceptable vibration and noise impacts for James Street residents and those at adjacent streets. The</p> | <p>approval conditions need to make clear the period of time for which the 'temporary' tunnel is to be used.</p> <p>IV. The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)</p> <p>V. The EIS social an economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestCONNEX has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.</p> <p>VI. Light construction vehicle routes – the EIS acknowledges that these vehicles will use 'dispersed' routes (8-62). In other words, construction vehicles will use and park on local roads. The EIS does not propose any management as to which roads they use. The addition of 70-100 light vehicle movements day in Leichhardt will result in our small, congested streets, which are already at capacity and suffering parking shortages, will have the added impact of workers travelling to and from the site and parking in local streets. There will be rat running. The EIS should provide an agreed route (using arterial roads only) that can be used by all vehicles associated with the project.</p> |
|--|---|

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties


Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: PETER ROSSSignature: 

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 16 BROWN STSuburb: ST PETERS NSW Postcode 2044**I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:**

- a. I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. The government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.
- b. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters, Haberfield and Rozelle Interchanges will disrupt local transport networks including bus and active transport (walking and cycling).
- c. I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.
- d. Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.
- e. The Air quality data provided in the EIS is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.
- f. The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement
- g. Impacts not provided - Permanent water treatment plant and substation - The EIS states that there will be an office, worker parking and buildings to accommodate this facility on a permanent basis. It does not provide any detail as to - noise impacts, numbers of workers on site, any health risks associated with the facility. This is simply inadequate and the decision to locate this facility should be subject to a thorough assessment and approval process. It should not be approved as part of this EIS as there is simply no detail provided about the impact of this facility on the amenity of the area.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Jessica Cann

Signature:



Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.

I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

118 Cavendish Street

Suburb:

Enmore

Postcode

2042

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- ◇ The warm and caring words contained in the EIS, ref Sustainability Management Strategy, have not been reflected in the wanton destruction of homes, trees and habitat already. Why should we believe them?
- ◇ I am concerned that while the EIS finds that tolls do weigh more heavily on lower income motorists, there is no serious analysis of the blatant unfairness of letting of private consortium toll people for decades in order to pay for less profitable tollways for wealthier communities.
- ◇ The EIS at 12-57 describes potentially serious problems where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs. Why is SMC proposing tunnelling within metres of these critical services when no accurate surveying has been done? And when there is only limited information available about the strength of these water tunnels? The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- ◇ We object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that it provides for daily movements of 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road. This creates an unacceptable risk to the safety of pedestrians accessing the North Leichhardt light rail stop as well as bicycle users accessing the bicycle route on Darley Road and entering Canal road to join the dedicated bike paths on the bay run. Many school children cross at this point to walk to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College. The EIS states that an alternative truck movement is proposed which involves use of the City West Link with no trucks to access Darley Road. The selection of Darley Road should not be approved if it involves any truck movements on Darley Road, which is what it currently provides.
- ◇ I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. The government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.
- ◇ The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters, Haberfield and Rozelle Interchanges will disrupt local transport networks including bus and active transport (walking and cycling).
- ◇ It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

From: [REDACTED] <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 12 October 2017 1:00 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning should reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

Firstly I object to the smoke stack and portals to the tunnel being located at the top of my street on Victoria Rd. Also the smoke stacks in the Rozelle goods yards and numerous portals located there also. These portals & smoke stacks will be concentrating carcinogenic emissions from vehicles right into our homes. Breathing this toxic air is going to cause an increase in many health issues and be the cause of deaths.

I also object to the homes along Victoria Rd being bought & bulldozed by WestCONnex to then become a car park for workers on the project. Even though that land is eventually supposed to be made into green space I fear that the area will be used for high rise developments in the future which will further put a strain on this already densely populated area.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

The number of vehicles that would go in and out of the site on a daily basis. 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road. This creates an unacceptable risk to the safety of pedestrians accessing the North Leichhardt light rail stop as well as bicycle users accessing the bicycle route on Darley Road and entering Canal road to join the dedicated bike paths on the bay run. Many school children cross at this point to walk to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College.

The EIS states that to minimise disruptions to traffic on the existing road network (including in peak hours) there will be night works where appropriate. Given the congested nature of Darley Road, it is likely there will be frequent night work (EIS, 6.4). This will create an unacceptable impact in residents. The community is well aware of the dreadful night noise that has impacted on the residents of Haberfield and finds it unacceptable that SMC and RMS would be again knowingly allowed to inflict it on another community. NSW Planning should not impose such open ended conditions. And, instead of a proper plan to manage traffic, the EIS contemplate work simply occurring. Night work is objected to in the strongest terms.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur – indeed, the State Opposition is opposed to both projects. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of much more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. I am appalled that these odours are predicted to possibly continue if Stage 3 is approved. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the intersection near the site (James St and City West Link), based on TfNSW's own data, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and accident black spot.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]

_____ This email was sent by [REDACTED] via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however [REDACTED] provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to [REDACTED]

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

From: Jane Druce <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Thursday, 12 October 2017 2:14 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I live extremely close to Dan Murphy's and am appalled that it could even be considered as a dive site. Darley Road is constantly congested and can hardly cope with cars little lone a constant barrage of trucks! I have lived here for 35 years and am disgusted at the secretive and suspicious way this site has been obtained.

I therefore strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning should reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur – indeed, the State Opposition is opposed to both projects. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of much more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. I am appalled that these odours are predicted to possibly continue if Stage 3 is approved. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the intersection near the site (James St and City West Link), based on TfNSW's own data, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and accident black spot.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, 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, Jane Druce Falls St, Leichhardt NSW 2040, Australia

This email was sent by Jane Druce via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Jane provided an email address (druce@iprimus.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jane Druce at druce@iprimus.com.au.

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

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Steve Muthiawerna

Signature: Muthiawerna

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration : I HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 1416 Moulden Ave

Suburb: Yokine Postcode: 6060

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

◇ EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. “..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval”. It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a “review(ed) for consistency”, and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant ‘uncertainties’ have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie : the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)

◇ The assessment and solution to potentially serious problems described in the EIS at 12-57 (where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney’s eastern and southern suburbs) is “based on assumptions about the strength and stiffness of the water tunnels given that limited information about the design and condition of these assets was available. Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water assets. A detailed assessment would be carried out in consultation with Sydney Water to demonstrate that construction of the M4-M5 Link tunnels would have negligible adverse settlement or vibration impacts on these tunnels. A settlement monitoring program would also be implemented during construction to validate or reassess the predictions should it be required.” The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.

◇ The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a


triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.

◇ Because this is still based on a “concept design” it is unknown how the communities affected will not know what is being done below their residences, schools, business premises and public spaces, particularly if the whole project is sold into a private corporation’s ownership before the actual designs and construction plans are determined. The EIS makes references to these designs and plans being reviewed but there is **NO** information as to what agency will be responsible for such reviews or whether the outcomes of such reviews will be made public. The communities below whose homes, business premises, public buildings and public spaces this massive project will be excavated and built will be completely in the dark about what is being done, what standards it is supposed to comply with, what inspection or scrutiny it will subject to, and whether the private corporations undertaking the work will be held to any liability by our government.

◇ The EIS uses maps indicating alignment of the mainline tunnels. It is clear from more detailed reading deep into the EIS (ie 12-57 Sydney Water Tunnels) that the alignment and depths of the tunnels may vary very significantly, after further survey work has been done and construction methodology determined by the construction contractor. The maps provided in the EIS are nothing more than ‘indicative’ and are misleading the community. The EIS should be withdrawn, corrected and updated, and reissued for genuine public comment based on ‘definitive’ information.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: THEODEN LEE
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: 36 Station St Suburb: Newtown Postcode 2042
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- ⇒ I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.
- ⇒ The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.
- ⇒ The business case for the project in all three stages has failed to taken into account the external costs of these massive road projects in air pollution for human and environmental health, in adding fossil fuel emissions to increase global warming effects, and in the economic and social costs of the disruption to human activities, of displacement of people and businesses and of the destruction of community cohesion and amenity. These external costs far outweigh any benefits from building roads which poorly serve people's transport needs but instead enrich private corporations.
- ⇒ Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)
- ⇒ EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the Process for addressing project uncertainties. *"The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in **Chapter 1**, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval".* The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485


Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

JASON HOBAN

Signature:



Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

55/110 Wellington St

Suburb:

2017

Postcode

Wade 12

Object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- ⇒ The EIS was released just 12 days after the closing date for submissions to the Concept Design. This categorically proves that all the Community Consultations and Submissions to the Concept Design were a total sham. There were at least 800 posts on the interactive map. These were limited as the community only had 140 characters available to make their point which was woefully inadequate. But there were at least 1500 written submissions, some of which were highly detailed and of considerable length. There is no way that all these submissions could have been read, considered, their arguments integrated into the EIS and then for the EIS of 7200 pages to be put together, printed and released 12 days after the the closing date for submissions to the Concept Design. There needs to be a major investigation into this flagrant abuse of the way NSW planning laws have been flouted for the whole of Westconnex and particularly Stage 3.
- ⇒ The EIS states that by 2033 Ross St will see an increase of 80 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. The greatest increase of Heavy vehicles at the PM peak will be in Johnston Street, which will see an increase of about 30-50 vehicles when compared to the 'without project' scenario. At Catherine St there will be an increase of 30 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. These streets will see a huge increase in Heavy vehicle movements if Stage 3 is built. The increase would be roughly half this amount if the project did not go ahead. Annexure Fig 26 B2 Section H
- ⇒ The EIS shows a diagrammatic explanation of the way the polluted air will be expelled from the Westconnex tunnels. This method will work on straight tunnels of short distance providing there is no traffic congestion. There are already signs in tunnel locations in Sydney advising motorists to roll up their windows and put on their 'in vehicle circulating' air conditioning. This type of straight line pollution expulsion doesn't work if the tunnels go around corners, which is the case with the tunnels from the Rozelle Rail Yards site.
- ⇒ The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.
- ⇒ I am concerned that the EIS provides no reasons why the City of Sydney's alternative plan might not be preferable to the proposed WestCONnex.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Carolyn Nersesian

Signature: Carolyn Nersesian

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 138 Corillon Ave #2121

Suburb: Newtown Postcode:

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- 2 G Appendix P Table 5-27 of the EIS states that 43% of the Leichhardt- Glebe Precinct travel to work by Car, 21% by Bus and 5% by Rail. These are figures for 2011. These figures are being used to promote the project and suggest they are accurate today. In the case of Rail these figures are extremely questionable. The Light Rail is now hugely popular, it's use having grown enormously. It is travelling at full capacity at Peak hours. More services are being put in place. Apartment blocks are being built as close to the Light Rail corridor as possible. Residents see the Light Rail as an efficient, reliable and timely method of commuting to work. It is blatantly obvious that the Govt should be investing heavily in building and extending Light Rail, Metro and Rail. If this were pursued in a professional manner the necessity for trying to hoodwink the community into believing that Westconnex were needed would be totally unnecessary.
- Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces provided for workers(EiS). The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately 550. This means that 150 vehicles will need to park in nearby local streets which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.
- The EIS lacks sufficient focus on traffic congestion in the suburbs of Alexandria and Erskineville. Are these being ignored because they will be even more congested than currently.
- The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed. All possible mitigation should be included as a condition of approval. The EIS acknowledges that substantial above ground invasive works will be required to demolish the Dan Murphys building and establish the road. The EIS noise projections indicate that for 10 weeks residents will suffer unacceptable noise impacts. The EIS does not contain a plan to manage or mitigate this terrible impact. There is no detail as to which homes will be offered (if at all) temporary relocation; there are no details of any noise walls or what treatments will be provided to individual homes that are badly affected. The approval needs to contain detail as to how this unacceptable impact will be managed and minimised during the construction period and, in particular, during site establishment.
- I object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that the works required (demolition and surface works) will create unacceptable and unbearable noise and vibration impacts for extended periods. The EIS indicates that at least 36 homes will basically be unliveable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.
- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning
Services,
Department of Planning and
Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

KAREN STECHINGER

Signature:

[Handwritten Signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

217 ST JOHNS RD

Suburb:

GLEBE

Postcode

2037

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

- ◇ A review of RMS traffic counts on numerous arterial routes within the 'sphere of influence' of the Project have shown no growth in traffic since 2006. During this period Sydney's population (as measured by the Greater Capital City Statistical Area) has grown at a rate of 1.5% per annum on average. Roads measured:

- Parramatta Rd at Ashfield (station 25002), Leichhardt (station 20012), Five Dock (station 30005) and Annandale
- ANZAC Bridge (station 20001)
- Anzac Parade Moore Park (station 03022 b/w 2008 and 2017)
- Cleveland Street (station 03022)
- Sydney Harbour Tunnel (station 01003)
- O'Riordan Street (station 02309)
- Sunnyholt Road Blacktown (station 69198)
- General Holmes Drive Brighton-Le-Sands (station 23055)
- King Georges Rd Roselands (station 24026)

- ◇ For example The St Peters / Sydney Park Interchange will overload the Mascot road network. As a result traffic levels were reduced to fit the modelling.
- ◇ It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and

substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

- ◇ Rozelle Rail Yards and Rozelle Civil Site. It is clear that the most highly affected area of Stage 3 will be the Rozelle area and the massive and hugely complex Rozelle interchange. The suggestion that Westconnex is capable of building this is highly questionable. Nothing like this has been built anywhere else in the World. Considering the simple problems of dust management, noxious gasses and the handling of toxic materials like asbestos that have been so inappropriately dealt with on Stages 1 and 2 by Westconnex this intersection of Stage 3 is a disaster waiting to happen and should definitely not be allowed to proceed without a massive investigation. What has been shown in the EIS is totally inadequate for this project to be allowed to proceed.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning
Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

KARIN STEININGER

Signature:

[Handwritten Signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

217 ST JOHNS RD

Suburb:

GLEBE

Postcode

2037

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

- ❖ The EIS uses criteria to assess the impact of existing walking and cycling routes that will need to be diverted as a result of the M4-M5 Link. The criteria are based on distance only and exclude the additional travel time taken to complete the diversion. This approach is flawed and should also consider travel time – if it did, this would completely change the assessment of the proposed removal of the existing pedestrian and cycle bridge over City West Link. (P 8-71, Table 8-50). Further, the EIS is silent as to whether the existing pedestrian and cycle bridge over City West Link will be replaced post-construction (P 8-73)
- ❖ I oppose the removal of further homes of Significance in either Haberfield or Ashfield. The level of destruction has already been appalling. Residents were led to expect that there would be no further construction impacts after the completion of the M4 East. The loss of further houses of the community will cause further distress within this community.
- ❖ According to the EIS, buses travelling to the CBD will be slower, despite the construction of a tunnel between Iron Cove and the Anzac Bridge. Bus travel times along Parramatta Road will improve, but only because bus lanes would be extended. This could be achieved without WestConnex and for several billions of dollars less.
- ❖ Significant improvements in rapid public transport are required for significant urban renewal. The experience in Sydney is that public transport is a strong and effective catalyst for urban renewal e.g. Green Square; Ultimo-Pyrmont with light rail; the Anzac Parade corridor, again with light rail; and Sydney Metro City and South West at Waterloo and along the Bankstown Line. The key ingredient is the political will to reallocate road space to rapid transit, or invest in dedicated rail solutions.
- ❖ The EIS admits that it is not even known what excavation would be undertaken at the White Bay Power station. I am particularly concerned about the old water channels and the southern penstock which are part of Sydney's industrial heritage. How could an EIS for such a major project be put forward on this basis? It is fatuous to state that "physical and indirect impacts on this heritage element should be avoided" and suggest that a future plan should be done. Why isn't the need for excavation known? This raises great concerns about the 'indicative only' nature of the work that has been done before this EIS. Why is there such a rush? This EIS is not complete and should be rejected for that reason.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: KARIN STELHINGER

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 217 ST JOHNS RD

Suburb: GLEBE NSW Postcode: 2037

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

⇒ I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project, There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Peters and Haberfield or Rozelle, all traffic going to the CBD, East or into the Inner West will use local roads.

⇒ The RMS has previously identified the Darley Rd site in Leichhardt as the third most dangerous traffic hazard in the Inner West. The NSW Land and Environment Court found that the location of the site couldn't safely deal with 60 bottle truck movements a week, but the M4/M5 EIS shows that more than 800 vehicles including hundreds of heavy ones will use the site each day as part of construction of M4M5 Link. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why are the already acknowledged impacts being ignored.

⇒ Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.

⇒ King Street Gateway is not included in modelling or Cumulative impact assessment however will alter the road geometry and capacity adjacent to the project.

⇒ The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations.

There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.

⇒ Significant declines in pollutants are due to improvements to in-vehicle technology and fuel. However, plans to improve standards for heavy vehicles, which disproportionately contribute to NOx emissions and thus ozone, appear to have stalled. The proponent needs to provide a scenario that sets out impacts due to delays in adopting improved emission standards.

⇒ Bridge Road School - Pyrmont Bridge Road site - The EIS states that 'construction activities are predicted to impact' this School. However, the only mitigation proposed is to consult with the School 'to identify sensitive receivers of the school along with periods of examination'. (Table 5-120) The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not propose any measures to reduce the impacts to this School. The EIS simply states that 'where practicable' work should be scheduled to avoid major student examination period when students are studying for examinations such as the Higher School Certificate. This is inadequate and students will be studying every day in preparation for examinations and this proposal will impact on their ability to be provided with an education. Consultation is not considered an adequate response and detailed mitigation should be provided which will reduce the impacts to students to an acceptable level.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Alexandro Sacedon

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 28 a Rosemead Rd

Suburb: Hornby Postcode: 2077

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link


- ◆ Increased traffic on local roads will decrease residential amenity and decrease the potential for new higher density housing. This will affect numerous streets, with particularly major impacts on The Crescent, Minogue Crescent, Ross, Mount Vernon, Catherine, Ross and Arundel streets in Glebe; and Euston Road, McEvoy, Botany, Wyndham, Bourke and Lachlan Streets in the Green Square area. In the redevelopment areas, land adjoining these streets may suffer a loss of development potential, a loss of value and will bear the additional costs of designing for noisy environments.
- ◆ The EIS admits that the people who live in western Sydney have lower incomes than in the inner suburbs and that the tolls will therefore be a heavier cost in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, Blacktown or Wetherill Park than in Strathfield or Padstow. This is unfair when the benefits of Stage 3 are all for north-south connections to the northern beaches or the proposed new harbour tunnel.
- ◆ The EIS provides traffic projections for the 'With Project' scenario and 'cumulative' scenario (which in addition to links in the 'With Project' scenario includes the Beaches Link and F6 motorway connections), but when referencing the traffic benefits/impacts in the early sections, the EIS appears to cite the 'with project' scenario rather than Cumulative Scenario. It is unclear which scenarios the Business Case best reflects.
- ◆ The modelling makes no mention of bus lanes on Victoria Rd. If these lanes were not modelled as

car lanes the assumed capacity of the road is incorrect.

- ◆ The high tolls are set to increase for decades by the CPI or by 4% a year, whichever is higher. When inflation is low and wages are not even keeping up with low inflation this is outrageous. And it is not as if the commuters or workers of western Sydney have a real alternative in public transport. This is just gouging western Sydney road users to make the road attractive to a buyer
- ◆ The EIS admits that drivers from lower income households are more likely to travel longer distances to avoid tolls because of the cost. So you either pay the high tolls (capped at \$7.95 in 2015 dollars) or you drive for longer to avoid the tolls. We have seen this already where commuters have chose to drive on Parramatta rd not the new M4 with the new tolls. This is unfair.
- ◆ The 2023 'cumulative' modelling scenario includes the Sydney Gateway and the western harbour tunnel but neither of these projects are currently committed and it is highly unlikely they will be completed by this date. This raises the question of why did the proponent adopt such a misleading position and how does it affect the impacts stated?
- ◆ This EIS contains no meaningful design and construction details and no parameters as to how broad changes and therefore impacts could be. It therefore fails to allow the community to be informed about and comment on the project impacts in a meaningful way.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>John Stephens</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>Unit 5, 29 BLACK ST</u> Suburb: <u>STARRICK</u> Postcode <u>2204</u> <u>ville</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- ❖ The latest EIS was released just ten business days after feedback period ended for the Concept Design for the M4/M5 and before preliminary drilling to establish a route through the Inner West is completed. WHAT IS THE RUSH? This EIS is little more than a concept design and is far less developed than earlier ones. It is composed of many indicate only plans such that it is impossible to know what the impacts will be and yet approval is being sought in a rush. The EIS ignores more than 1500 submissions, including one of 142 pages from the Inner West Council.
- ❖ One toll road leads to another 3 being proposed. The EIS's for the M4 East and the New M5 argued the case that serious congestion created near interchanges would be solved once the M4/M5 was built. Now it seems this is not the case and more roads will be needed to relieve the congestion – WHERE DOES THIS END? According to the M4/M5 EIS the real benefits will depend on building the Western Harbour Tunnel, the Airport Link and a tollway heading South. None of these projects have been planned, let alone approved but yet are part of addressing the congestion impacts acknowledged for the M4/M5link project. Given this how is it possible to know or address the impacts of the M4/M5 Link, unless this is just yet more justification for yet more roads?
- ❖ Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.
- ❖ Where is the commitment to community consultation and to long term planning when the EIS for the M4/M5 Link is released before any response to the extensive community feedback on the M4-M5 Link concept design could possibly have been seriously considered. This demonstrates deep government contempt for the people of NSW and the communities of the Inner West of Sydney in particular.
- ❖ The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.
- ❖ For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>John Stephens</u>	
	Address: <u>S/29 BLACK ST</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>MARRICKVILLE</u>	Postcode <u>2204</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project, There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Peters and Haberfield or Rozelle, all traffic going to the CBD, East or into the Inner West will use local roads.
- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. "..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval". It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a "review(ed) for consistency", and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie : the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)
- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
- Why is there no detailed information about the so called 'King Street Gateway' included in the EIS ?
- An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow 'swoosh' that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be 'encouraged' to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that 'definitive' rather than 'indicative' alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair 'definitive' document open for genuine public comment.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>John Stephens</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>S/29 BLACK ST</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>MARRICKVILLE</u> Postcode: <u>2204</u>	

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.
- In Leichhardt serious safety concerns about the choice of the Darley Rd site have been raised by the Inner West Council and an independent engineer's report. Despite countless meetings between local residents and SMC and RMS over 12 months, none of the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents have even been acknowledged. This is a massive breach of community trust and seriously questions the integrity of the EIS.
- The RMS has previously identified the Darley Rd site in Leichhardt as the third most dangerous traffic hazard in the Inner West. The NSW Land and Environment Court found that the location of the site couldn't safely deal with 60 bottle truck movements a week, but the M4/M5 EIS shows that more than 800 vehicles including hundreds of heavy ones will use the site each day as part of construction of M4M5 Link. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why are the already acknowledged impacts being ignored.
- It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.
- The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. In relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.
- EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>ZHONDA BAKER</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>36/50 MACKAY ST,</u> Suburb: <u>BAY PT</u> Postcode <u>2011</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- ❖ The latest EIS was released just ten business days after feedback period ended for the Concept Design for the M4/M5 and before preliminary drilling to establish a route through the Inner West is completed. WHAT IS THE RUSH? This EIS is little more than a concept design and is far less developed than earlier ones. It is composed of many indicate only plans such that it is impossible to know what the impacts will be and yet approval is being sought in a rush. The EIS ignores more than 1500 submissions, including one of 142 pages from the Inner West Council.
- ❖ One toll road leads to another 3 being proposed. The EIS's for the M4 East and the New M5 argued the case that serious congestion created near interchanges would be solved once the M4/M5 was built. Now it seems this is not the case and more roads will be needed to relieve the congestion – WHERE DOES THIS END? According to the M4/M5 EIS the real benefits will depend on building the Western Harbour Tunnel, the Airport Link and a tollway heading South. None of these projects have been planned, let alone approved but yet are part of addressing the congestion impacts acknowledged for the M4/M5link project. Given this how is it possible to know or address the impacts of the M4/M5 Link, unless this is just yet more justification for yet more roads?
- ❖ Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.
- ❖ Where is the commitment to community consultation and to long term planning when the EIS for the M4/M5 Link is released before any response to the extensive community feedback on the M4-M5 Link concept design could possibly have been seriously considered. This demonstrates deep government contempt for the people of NSW and the communities of the Inner West of Sydney in particular.
- ❖ The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.
- ❖ For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Nathan Claydon</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>69 Gowrie St.</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <u>Newtown</u> Postcode <u>2042</u>
<p style="text-align: center;">Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement
- The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.
- The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.
- The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.
- It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.
- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downplays concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. The raises the question of whether this is a result of the failure of SMC to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters about the potential impacts of the M4 M5
- The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Nathan Clayton

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration : I HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 49 GARRIE STREET

Suburb: HEWLETT Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The Concept Design was a woefully inadequate document totally devoid of any real depth of detail in terms of maps, scales, distances with only vague suggestions and glamorized Artist's Impressions of an idealized view of what Stage 3 would be like. It was another example of current city planning documents that consistently accentuate huge areas of tranquil green spaces with families and children out walking and riding bicycles in idealized parks and suburbs. All this is total PR spin and bears no reality about the real outcome of the build. It bears no reality as to what Stage 3 of Westconnex will be like.
- The City West Link Eastbound AM and PM peak hour and other locations. "Table 7-19 shows that several locations are forecast to exceed theoretical roadway capacity with the increased background traffic and the construction traffic in the 2021 AM and PM peak hours. However, traffic on the majority of these roads would exceed their theoretical capacity even without the construction traffic, simply due to the growth in background traffic". So in the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, massive amounts of construction traffic are going to be added for the whole construction period of 5 years. Even on completion it is stated in the EIS that traffic will be worse in this area than 'without the project'. This categorically shows that the planning of Westconnex is totally inadequate and needs major changes. It also shows that when completed Westconnex will not work. It is abundantly obvious that Rail/Metro is the only option to radically overhaul Sydney's failed transport systems
- The Health costs of outdoor Air Pollution in Australia are up to \$8.4 Billion a year. The Health costs of Particulate Pollution in the Sydney Greater Metropolitan area is around \$4.7 Billion a year. With no filtration on the Westconnex tunnels these Health costs will rise substantially.
- Along with the widening of the Crescent at Annandale the White's Creek bridge is to be rebuilt. This will mean that the road in this area will be reduced in width as first one side of the bridge is rebuilt followed by the other. Added to the additional volume of trucks from the Rozelle Rail Yards, the Crescent Civil site and the Camperdown site this is going to lead to massive congestion on Johnston St and all along the Crescent towards Ross St and make it virtually impossible for residents to exit and return to their local area. It is most likely that the commercial sectors of the Tramsheds development will be badly affected.
- Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution— most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a massive number of extra truck movements and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times.
- Motor vehicles account for 14% of Particulate Pollution of 2.5 microns and less in Australia. There is no safe level to exposure to particulate matter of 2.5 microns and less. Particulate matter is linked with Asthma, Lung Disease, Cancer and Stroke.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Nathan Claydon

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 49 Gennie St

Suburb: Newtown Postcode 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- Given that the modelling for air quality is based on the traffic modelling, which, as shown above, is fundamentally flawed, and given poor air quality has a significant health impact the EIS should not be approved until an independent scientifically qualified reviewer has analysed the stated air quality outcomes and identified any deficits
- Significant declines in pollutants are due to improvements to in-vehicle technology and fuel. However, plans to improve standards for heavy vehicles, which disproportionately contribute to NOx emissions and thus ozone, appear to have stalled. The proponent needs to provide a scenario that sets out impacts due to delays in adopting improved emission standards.
- Part 3 of the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements requires assessment of the likely risks of the project to public safety, paying particular attention to pedestrian safety. This is not addressed in Chapter 8.
- The EIS admits that the people who live in western Sydney have lower incomes than in the inner suburbs and that the tolls will therefore be a heavier cost in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, Blacktown or Wetherill Park than in Strathfield or Padstow. This is unfair when the benefits of Stage 3 are all for north-south connections to the northern beaches or the proposed new harbour tunnel.
- The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. We now have the proposals for Stages 1,2 and 3 and they don't even go to Port Botany or Sydney Airport. We are being asked to support Stage 3 of WestConnex on the basis of more major unfunded projects that are barely sketches on a map.
- The EIS provides traffic projections for the 'With Project' scenario and 'cumulative' scenario (which in addition to links in the 'With Project' scenario includes the Beaches Link and F6 motorway connections), but when referencing the traffic benefits/impacts in the early sections, the EIS appears to cite the 'with project' scenario rather than Cumulative Scenario. It is unclear which scenarios the Business Case best reflects.
- We know the state government intends to sell the project, both the constructing and the operation. I object to the privatization of the road system. There is no guarantee of protecting the public interest in an efficient transport system when so much of it operates to make a profit for shareholders.
- The modelling makes no mention of bus lanes on Victoria Rd. If these lanes were not modelled as car lanes the assumed capacity of the road is incorrect.
- The modelling shows severe degradation to the City West Link if the Western Harbour Tunnel is connected.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: Matthew Clayton

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 49 Gawnie St

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport
Assessments


Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The City West Link Eastbound AM and PM peak hour and other locations. "Table 7-19 shows that several locations are forecast to exceed theoretical roadway capacity with the increased background traffic and the construction traffic in the 2021 AM and PM peak hours. However, traffic on the majority of these roads would exceed their theoretical capacity even without the construction traffic, simply due to the growth in background traffic". So in the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, massive amounts of construction traffic are going to be added for the whole construction period of 5 years. Even on completion it is stated in the EIS that traffic will be worse in this area than 'without the project'. This categorically shows that the planning of Westconnex is totally inadequate and needs major changes. It also shows that when completed Westconnex will not work. It is abundantly obvious that Rail/Metro is the only option to radically overhaul Sydney's failed transport systems
- I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.
- 2 G Appendix P Table 5-27 of the EIS states that 43% of the Leichhardt- Glebe Precinct travel to work by Car, 21% by Bus and 5% by Rail. These are figures for 2011. These figures are being used to promote the project and suggest they are accurate today. In the case of Rail these figures are extremely questionable. The Light Rail is now hugely popular, it's use having grown enormously. It is travelling at full capacity at Peak hours. More services are being put in place. Apartment blocks are being built as close to the Light Rail corridor as possible. Residents see the Light Rail as an efficient, reliable and timely method of commuting to work. It is blatantly obvious that the Govt should be investing heavily in building and extending Light Rail, Metro and Rail. If this were pursued in a professional manner the necessity for trying to hoodwink the community into believing that Westconnex were needed would be totally unnecessary.
- The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Nathan Clayton</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>49 Gowrie St</u>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <u>Newtown</u>	Postcode <u>2042</u>
Signature: 	Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS M4/M5 Application, for the following reasons:

1. I object

2. I have strong objections to proceeding in the face of the unknown hazard associated with two different tunnelling operations taking place in close time and location - the tunnelling for the M4-M5 link and the proposed Sydney Metro tunnelling in the same area - Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond. The impact of this combined tunnelling is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the residences and buildings above, many of them very old and heritage listed. This is a serious community safety issue and residents who do experience damage will be caught between 2 separate contractors for repairs and compensation.
3. The high cost of the tolls has already resulted in an increase in traffic on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. Their anticipated annual increase will likely mean that more and more commuters will seek to avoid the expensive tolls. It makes sense to expect the same effect on the roads around the St Peters Interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware Rd and Enmore Rd and though the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria. The increasing numbers of vehicles will mean more vehicle pollution in the area (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic). A viable public train system would easily and effectively manage commuter traffic without the requirement for expensive private tollways.
4. The business case for the project in all three stages does not take into account the costs of external impacts of air pollution for human and environmental health; increased fossil fuel emissions contributing to increase global warming; and in the economic and social costs of the disruption to human activities; of displacement of people and businesses; and of the destruction of community cohesion and amenity. These external costs far outweigh the questionable short term benefits of building roads which poorly serve people's transport needs and are not sustainable in the long term.
5. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters Interchange will have a heavy disruptive impact on the local transport routes, whether by vehicle, bus, or active transport (walking and cycling).
6. The increasing numbers of vehicles on the roads around the St Peters Interchange will increase the vehicle pollution (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic) in this area.

I call on the Minister for Planning to reject this project and demand that the government re-think the transport planning for the whole metropolitan area.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name: _____; Email: _____; Mobile: _____

Attention Director

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,

Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Name: *Nathan Clayton*

Address: *49 Gorgie St,*

Application Number: *SSI 7485*

Suburb: *Newtown*

Postcode *2042*

Application Name: *WestConnex M4-M5 Link*

Signature: *[Signature]*

Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS M4/M5 Application, for the following reasons:

1. The business case for the project in all three stages does not take into account the costs of external impacts of air pollution for human and environmental health; increased fossil fuel emissions contributing to increase global warming; and in the economic and social costs of the disruption to human activities; of displacement of people and businesses; and of the destruction of community cohesion and amenity. These external costs far outweigh the questionable short term benefits of building roads which poorly serve people's transport needs and are not sustainable in the long term.
2. I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.
3. I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1000s of comments on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in the time. This questions the integrity of the entire EIS process.
4. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity.
5. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will direct onto the roads to and from the St Peters Interchange will have a heavy disruptive impact on the local transport routes, whether by vehicle, bus, or active transport (walking and cycling).
6. Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware Rd and Enmore Rd and though the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.
7. The increasing numbers of vehicles will mean more vehicle pollution in the area (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic).
8. The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.
9. I object to there being two different tunnelling operations taking place in close proximity in time and location - the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link and the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond. The impact of this combined tunnelling is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the residences and buildings above, many of them very old and heritage listed. This is a serious community safety issue and residents who do experience damage will be caught between 2 separate contractors for repairs and compensation.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____; Email: _____; Mobile: _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Alec Colquhoun

Signature: Alec Colquhoun

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 4 First Ave

Suburb: Cymene Bay Postcode: 2227

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments


Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- ❖ The EIS states that there may be a 'small increase in pollutant concentrations' near surface roads. The EIS states that potential health impacts associated with changes in air quality (specifically nitrogen dioxide and particulates) within the local community have been assessed and are considered to be 'acceptable.' We disagree that the impacts on human health are acceptable and object to the project in its entirety because of these impacts.
- ❖ I am concerned that the EIS provides no reasons why the City of Sydney's alternative plan might not be preferable to the proposed WestConnex.
- ❖ There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be date. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.
- ❖ The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.
- ❖ An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow 'swoosh' that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be 'encouraged' to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that 'definitive' rather than 'indicative' alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair 'definitive' document open for genuine public comment.
- ❖ EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: CATHERINE DUGGAN
	Address: 10 WINDSOR STREET
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: PADDINGTON Postcode 2021
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- ❖ The latest EIS was released just ten business days after feedback period ended for the Concept Design for the M4/M5 and before preliminary drilling to establish a route through the Inner West is completed. WHAT IS THE RUSH? This EIS is little more than a concept design and is far less developed than earlier ones. It is composed of many indicate only plans such that it is impossible to know what the impacts will be and yet approval is being sought in a rush. The EIS ignores more than 1500 submissions, including one of 142 pages from the Inner West Council.
- ❖ One toll road leads to another 3 being proposed. The EIS's for the M4 East and the New M5 argued the case that serious congestion created near interchanges would be solved once the M4/M5 was built. Now it seems this is not the case and more roads will be needed to relieve the congestion – WHERE DOES THIS END? According to the M4/M5 EIS the real benefits will depend on building the Western Harbour Tunnel, the Airport Link and a tollway heading South. None of these projects have been planned, let alone approved but yet are part of addressing the congestion impacts acknowledged for the M4/M5link project. Given this how is it possible to know or address the impacts of the M4/M5 Link, unless this is just yet more justification for yet more roads?
- ❖ Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.
- ❖ Where is the commitment to community consultation and to long term planning when the EIS for the M4/M5 Link is released before any response to the extensive community feedback on the M4-M5 Link concept design could possibly have been seriously considered. This demonstrates deep government contempt for the people of NSW and the communities of the Inner West of Sydney in particular.
- ❖ The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.
- ❖ For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

<p>Attention Director Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Sarah Parkes</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>[Signature]</u></p> <p>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>Rochford St</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Erskineville</u> Postcode <u>2043</u></p>
---	--

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.
- The EIS at 12-57 describes possible disruptions of water supply to a vast area of Sydney as a result of tunnelling in the proximity of two major Sydney Water Tunnels in the Newtown area, stating "Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water Assets". Why has an EIS been published that infers that the tunnel alignments have been thoroughly surveyed and researched, when further survey work could dramatically alter the alignments in the future ?
- The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.
- The assessment and solution to potentially serious problems described in the EIS at 12-57 (where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs) is "based on assumptions about the strength and stiffness of the water tunnels given that limited information about the design and condition of these assets was available. Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water assets. A detailed assessment would be carried out in consultation with Sydney Water to demonstrate that construction of the M4-M5 Link tunnels would have negligible adverse settlement or vibration impacts on these tunnels. A settlement monitoring program would also be implemented during construction to validate or reassess the predictions should it be required." The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- It all very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485


Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

BRIAN McLELLAN

Signature:



Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

346 BULLS ROAD

Suburb:

CLONULLA

Postcode

2230

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- ◆ The EIS states that darley Road is a contaminated site, and likely has asbestos. The proposal is that 'treated' water will be directly discharged into the stormwater drain at Blackmore oval. There are four long-standing rowing clubs in the vicinity of this location. This plan will jeopardise the integrity of our waterway and compromise the use of the bay for recreational activities for boat and other users. We object in the strongest terms to this proposal on environmental and health reasons. There is no detail of the ongoing Motorway maintenance activities during operation provided in the EIS. The community therefore cannot comment on the impact that this ongoing facility will have on the locality. This component of the EIS should not be approved as this information is not provided and therefore impacts (on parking, safety, noise, amenity of the area) are not known.
 - ◆ It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle
 - ◆ The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.
 - ◆ Traffic diversions – Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction' (8-65). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents.
- Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.
- ◆ The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

<p>Attention Director Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Paula Morgan</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>P. Morgan</u></p> <p>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>7/406 Railway Parade</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Allawah</u> Postcode <u>2218</u></p>
---	--

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- A. THE LATEST EIS WAS RELEASED JUST TEN BUSINESS DAYS AFTER FEEDBACK PERIOD ENDED FOR THE CONCEPT DESIGN FOR THE M4/M5 AND BEFORE PRELIMINARY DRILLING TO ESTABLISH A ROUTE THROUGH THE INNER WEST IS COMPLETED. WHAT IS THE RUSH? THIS EIS IS LITTLE MORE THAN A CONCEPT DESIGN AND IS FAR LESS DEVELOPED THAN EARLIER ONES. IT IS COMPOSED OF MANY INDICATE ONLY PLANS SUCH THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO KNOW WHAT THE IMPACTS WILL BE AND YET APPROVAL IS BEING SOUGHT IN A RUSH. THE EIS IGNORES MORE THAN 1500 SUBMISSIONS, INCLUDING ONE OF 142 PAGES FROM THE INNER WEST COUNCIL.
- B. ONE TOLL ROAD LEADS TO ANOTHER 3 BEING PROPOSED. THE EIS'S FOR THE M4 EAST AND THE NEW M5 ARGUED THE CASE THAT SERIOUS CONGESTION CREATED NEAR INTERCHANGES WOULD BE SOLVED ONCE THE M4/M5 WAS BUILT. NOW IT SEEMS THIS IS NOT THE CASE AND MORE ROADS WILL BE NEEDED TO RELIEVE THE CONGESTION – WHERE DOES THIS END? ACCORDING TO THE M4/M5 EIS THE REAL BENEFITS WILL DEPEND ON BUILDING THE WESTERN HARBOUR TUNNEL, THE AIRPORT LINK AND A TOLLWAY HEADING SOUTH. NONE OF THESE PROJECTS HAVE BEEN PLANNED, LET ALONE APPROVED BUT YET ARE PART OF ADDRESSING THE CONGESTION IMPACTS ACKNOWLEDGED FOR THE M4/M5 LINK PROJECT. GIVEN THIS HOW IS IT POSSIBLE TO KNOW OR ADDRESS THE IMPACTS OF THE M4/M5 LINK, UNLESS THIS IS JUST YET MORE JUSTIFICATION FOR YET MORE ROADS?
- C. RESEARCH ABOUT ROADS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATES THAT ROADS CREATE CONGESTION. THE WESTCONNEX PROJECT IS NO DIFFERENT AND THE EIS CLEARLY INDICATES THAT THIS IS AN IMPACT OF THE M4/M5 AND THE CONSEQUENT ROADS THAT WILL FOLLOW. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE M4/M5 LINK EIS ITSELF INDICATES THE RMS IS ALREADY HARD AT WORK CONSIDERING HOW TO SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS – OF CONGESTION CAUSED BY ROADS.
- D. WHERE IS THE COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND TO LONG TERM PLANNING WHEN THE EIS FOR THE M4/M5 LINK IS RELEASED BEFORE ANY RESPONSE TO THE EXTENSIVE COMMUNITY FEEDBACK ON THE M4-M5 LINK CONCEPT DESIGN COULD POSSIBLY HAVE BEEN SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED. THIS DEMONSTRATES DEEP GOVERNMENT CONTEMPT FOR THE PEOPLE OF NSW AND THE COMMUNITIES OF THE INNER WEST OF SYDNEY IN PARTICULAR.
- E. THE EIS WAS PREPARED BY GLOBAL ENGINEERING FIRM AECOM, WHICH ALSO PREPARED THE EIS FOR STAGES 1 AND 2. WHEN HE APPROVED THESE EARLIER STAGES, THE THEN MINISTER FOR PLANNING ROB STOKES POINTED TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THAT WOULD MINIMISE IMPACTS ON COMMUNITIES. BUT THE IMPACTS HAVE TURNED OUT TO WORSE THAN EXPECTED.
- F. FOR EXAMPLE, THE AECOM EIS FOR THE NEW M5 FAILED TO DEAL WITH HOW THE MASSIVELY CONTAMINATED LAND FILL AT ALEXANDRIA WOULD BE MANAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION. AFTER MONTHS OF SICKENING ODOURS, THE NSW EPA ADMITS THAT DESPITE FINING SMC AND REQUIRING CONTRACTORS TO TAKE MEASURES TO CONTROL ODOURS, THEY HAVE NOT STOPPED. IT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT IT DOES NOT HAVE THE POWER TO STOP WORK UNTIL WESTCONNEX CONTRACTORS COMPLY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from: Name: <u>Alan</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: <u>20 Douglas Parade, Peakhurst</u> Suburb: <u>Peakhurst</u> Postcode: <u>2222</u>	Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
---	--

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application.**

- ◆ Rozelle Rail Yards and Rozelle Civil Site. It is clear that the most highly affected area of Stage 3 will be the Rozelle area and the massive and hugely complex Rozelle interchange. The suggestion that Westconnex is capable of building this is highly questionable. Nothing like this has been built anywhere else in the World. Considering the simple problems of dust management, noxious gasses and the handling of toxic materials like asbestos that have been so inappropriately dealt with on Stages 1 and 2 by Westconnex this intersection of Stage 3 is a disaster waiting to happen and should definitely not be allowed to proceed without a massive investigation. What has been shown in the EIS is totally inadequate for this project to be allowed to proceed.
- ◆ The proposed work hours for the Rozelle Rail Yards are tunnelling and spoil handling 24 hours a day seven days a week. Civil construction Mon - Fri 7.00am – 6.00pm, Sat 8.00am -1.00 pm. There will be no night work at The Crescent Civil Site and the daytime hours are stated to be the same as at the Rozelle Rail Yards. However as has been experienced by those at Haberfield and St Peters these hours and especially late and night work have been extended and implemented when the schedule has fallen behind and this has lead to physical and mental stress for many residents through interrupted sleep and loss of sleep especially with children. The roads and sites at night in the area will see a marked increase in noise from truck movements, truck reversing alarms and running machinery. It will also see a marked increase in light during the night hours with site illumination and vehicle head lights as has been experienced in other areas. These problems have not been properly addressed and are not adequately dealt with in the EIS.
- ◆ The tunnels under Rozelle/Lilyfield are going to be in three levels. The EIS does not explain what safety procedures are being built into the project to deal with situations like serious congestion, accidents or fire. With a serious hold up on the deepest of these tunnels it is clear that the air quality will very quickly become toxic unless substantial air conditioning is a major part of the design. There is no in depth detail about how these issues are going to be addressed. This is not acceptable.
- ◆ One of the main reasons for establishing Buruwan Park was as a relatively quiet nature corridor for wildlife not for successions of children's parties so the assessment of this area in the EIS is entirely blinkered and inaccurate. The Rozelle Rail Yards site that may appear to development driven planners as an unattractive and wasted eyesore is ironically a very important nature reserve. It is perhaps the only area in the Annandale/Glebe area where Fairy Wrens can be found because of the substantial bush cover. This is very important as where these birds are found nature tends to be in balance which is not the case in parks like Easton Park and Bicentennial Park.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

Suburb:


Postcode:

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- ◆ The EIS states that darley Road is a contaminated site, and likely has asbestos. The proposal is that 'treated' water will be directly discharged into the stormwater drain at Blackmore oval. There are four long-standing rowing clubs in the vicinity of this location. This plan will jeopardise the integrity of our waterway and compromise the use of the bay for recreational activities for boat and other users. We object in the strongest terms to this proposal on environmental and health reasons. There is no detail of the ongoing Motorway maintenance activities during operation provided in the EIS. The community therefore cannot comment on the impact that this ongoing facility will have on the locality. This component of the EIS should not be approved as this information is not provided and therefore impacts (on parking, safety, noise, amenity of the area) are not known.
 - ◆ It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle
 - ◆ The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.
 - ◆ Traffic diversions – Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction' (8-65). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents.
- Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.
- ◆ The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: DARINKA MARUN Signature: 
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: 3/102 Alice St Suburb: Newtown Postcode 2042

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application

- ❖ Because this is still based on a “concept design” it is unknown how the communities affected will not know what is being done below their residences, schools, business premises and public spaces, particularly if the whole project is sold into a private corporation’s ownership before the actual designs and construction plans are determined. The EIS makes references to these designs and plans being reviewed but there is **NO** information as to what agency will be responsible for such reviews or whether the outcomes of such reviews will be made public. The communities below whose homes, business premises, public buildings and public spaces this massive project will be excavated and built will be completely in the dark about what is being done, what standards it is supposed to comply with, what inspection or scrutiny it will subject to, and whether the private corporations undertaking the work will be held to any liability by our government.
- ❖ No road junction as large and complex as the extraordinary spaghetti junction proposed to go underground has been built anywhere in the world. The feasibility is not tested. There are no international or national standards for such a construction.
- ❖ Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.
- ❖ The EIS does not provide appropriate parking for the estimated 100 or so workers that the EIS states will work every day at the site, while other equivalent sites have allocated parking for such workers (Northcote Civil site (150)) and Parramatta Road East Civil site (140). It is also noted that the EIS provides for loss of 20 residential parks on Darley Road. Local streets are at capacity already because of the lack of off-street parking for many residents and the Light Rail stop which means that commuters use local streets. The EIS states that workers ‘will be encouraged to use public transport.’ the EIS needs to mandate that no trucks or construction vehicles are to park in local streets. There needs to be a requirement that is enforceable that workers use the Light Rail stop which is adjacent to the site or a plan to bus in workers
- ❖ Streets in Haberfield would be subject to heavy vehicle traffic for a further four years, making at least 7 years of heavy impacts on a single suburb. The answer is not a “community strategy”. Residents who believed that their pain would be over after the M4 east are now being asked to sustain a further four years of impacts. No compensation or serious mitigation is suggested.
- ❖ The EIS does not require an acoustic shed and states that ‘Acoustic barriers and devices at the access tunnel entrances would be considered and implemented where reasonable and feasible to minimise potential noise impacts associated with out-of-hours works within the tunnels.’

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Darinka Marun

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 3/102 Alvie St

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
 Link

- ◆ There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.
- ◆ The EIS currently permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the site (and based on experience with cars accessing the site for Dan Murphy's), queuing will be the norm and not the exception. The EIS needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads
- ◆ SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- ◆ The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.
- ◆ I object to the location of a permanent substation and water treatment plant following the completion of the project on the Darley Road site. This will limit the future uses of the land and the community has been continually assured that the land, which is Government-owned, would be available for community purposes. The presence of this facility will forever prevent the ability for safe and direct pedestrian access to the light rail stop, with users required to walk down a dark and winding path. It will also limit the future use of the site. If a permanent facility is to be located then it should be moved to the north of the site so that it is out of sight of homes and has less visual impact on residents.
- ◆ I am deeply disappointed that the EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain. This is a dangerous and reckless attempt to get approval for a project that is yet to be properly designed.
- ◆ I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.

I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

Suburb:

Postcode

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.


- (1) Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.
- (2) The Darley Road site will not be returned after the project, with a substantial portion permanently housing a Motorways Operations facility which involves a substation and water treatment plant. This means that the residents will not be able to directly access the North Light rail Station from Darley Road but will have to traverse Canal Road and use the narrow path from the side. In addition the presence of this facility reduces the utility of this vital land which could be turned into a community facility. Over the past 12 months community representatives were repeatedly told that the land would be returned and this has not occurred. We also object to the location of this type of infrastructure in a neighbourhood setting.
- (3) Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.
- (4) It all very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- (5) Traffic diversions – Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction' (8-65). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents. Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application #SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Kenn Pemberton

Signature: 

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 92 Marian St

Suburb: Enmore Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- ◆ The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other. The increasing numbers of vehicles will also increase the vehicle pollution (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic) in this area.
- ◆ The mechanical ventilation proposed depends on single direction tunnel construction, so how it can possibly work for large curved tunnels on multiple levels is unknown.
- ◆ The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.
- ◆ The EIS proposes removal of all vegetation on the Darley Road site. There is a mature tree located on the site which serves as a visual and noise barrier to the heavy City West Link traffic. Removal of this tree and other vegetation will increase noise impacts to nearby residents and affect the visual amenity, with homes having a direct line of sight to the City West Link. The existing mature tree needs to be retained on this and environmental grounds.
- ◆ The EIS needs to provide specific detail as to what will be provided by way of alternative accommodation to the 36 residents identified as suffering extreme noise interference. There is no plan to temporarily relocate such residents, not to offer them financial compensation to enable them to move out during the worst period. There is an estimated 10 weeks of extreme noise during demolition of the commercial building and preparatory road works. Once this work is finished the residents will also be forced to endure a truck every 304 minutes for a period of five years. It is clearly not possible for such residents to continue to live in these houses and the EIS needs to detail what will be provided in terms of alternative living arrangements for part, or all of the construction work period.
- ◆ The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction. (Executive Summary xviii)

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from: Name: <u>Kate Salt</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: <u>61 Cambridge Street</u> Suburb: <u>Stammore</u> Postcode: <u>2048</u>	Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
--	--

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application.**

- o Vegetation: Leichhardt. The mature trees on the Darley Road site should be preserved. If any trees are removed during construction it should be a condition of approval that they are replaced with mature trees.
- o It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With four unfiltered emissions stacks in the area plus a large number of exit portals, the residents of this area will suffer greatly from poisonous diesel particulates. This is negligent when you consider that , the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic. " As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."
- o Insufficient time has been given for the community to prepare submissions to the EIS, especially when one considers that whole neighbourhoods affected by the project were not even notified during the concept design period. e.g Newtown, east of King St.
- o All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street) should have a strict prohibition on any truck movements and worker contractor parking. These homes are already suffering the worst construction impacts of the work on the site and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and additional noise impacts. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all of these streets.
- o 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.
- o There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Submission to:

Name: Anne Mangan
Signature: Anne Mangan

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Application Number: SSI 7485

Address: 7 Albert St


Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

- The removal of spoil at the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to the largest amount of Spoil truck movements on the entire Stage 3 project: 517 Heavy truck movements a day, of which 46 are stated to take place at Peak hours. There will also be 10 Heavy truck movements a day from the Crescent Civil Site. The sheer number of trucks on the road will lead to massive increases in congestion. Maps in the EIS have the spoil trucks going to and from these sites from the Haberfield direction on the City West Link. This is also the direction that is being proposed for spoil truck movements from Darley Rd which is said to have 100 Heavy truck movements a day. It is stated that the cumulative effect of truck movements from all sites on the City West Link will be 700 (one way) Heavy truck movements a day and of that 208 will be in Peak hours. This plan totally lacks credibility.
- The Rozelle Rail Yards site is the location of 3 Unfiltered Pollution Stacks. There is a fourth stack on Victoria Rd close to Darling St. If the Western Harbour Tunnel is built there will also be a total of 7 Tunnel Portals. Tunnel Portals are also areas of high levels of pollution. It is totally unacceptable that the Pollution Stacks are unfiltered. In 2008 Gladys Berejiklian said of Labor "It's not too late, the Government can still ensure that filtration is a possibility. World's best practice is to filter tunnels. Why won't Labor allow people to sleep at night, knowing their children aren't inhaling toxins that could jeopardize their health now or in the future." It is totally unacceptable that the tunnels will not be filtered. Recently built tunnels in Tokyo successfully filter 98% of all pollutants.
- Generally the risk of settlement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35m. In the Rozelle area the tunnel will be at 30m in the Brockley St & Cheltenham St area, and it will be less than that in the Denison St area. Also it is planned to have another layer of tunnels above that in the Denison St area. From the cross section diagram Vol 2B appendix E part 2 the suggestion is that this higher level of tunnels will be at no more than 12m. This is of major concern. Numbers of people in the ongoing construction of Stage 1 and 2 have suffered extensive damage to their homes costing thousands of dollars to rectify caused by vibration and tunneling activities and although they followed all the elected procedures their claims have not been settled. This is totally unacceptable. There is nothing addressing these major concerns in the EIS.
- The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres underground. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 27metres. Piper St 37metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____


Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: MELINDA CALDWELL
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: 4 EGAN ST
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode 2042
Signature: 	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONNex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement
- The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.
- The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.
- The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.
- It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.
- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downplays concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. The raises the question of whether this is a result of the failure of SMC to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters about the potential impacts of the M4 M5
- The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____


<p>Attention Director Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>KATE SHARKEY</u></p> <p>Signature: </p> <p><small>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</small></p> <p>Address: <u>9,16 Australia St, Camperdown</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>CAMPERDOWN</u> Postcode: <u>2050</u></p>
---	---

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- The EIS social and economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestConnex has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.
- The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.
- The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.
- I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtering stacks extra stacks could be added later.
- The EIS acknowledges that impacts of construction should M4M5 get approval will worsen traffic congestions on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it would be outrageous for motorists to be asked to pay up to up to \$20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.
- Streets in Haberfield would be subject to heavy vehicle traffic for a further four years, making at least 7 years of heavy impacts on a single suburb. The answer is not a "community strategy". Residents who believed that their pain would be over after the M4 east are now being asked to sustain a further four years of impacts. No compensation or serious mitigation is suggested.
- The EIS acknowledges that four years of M4/M5 construction would have a negative economic and social impact across the Inner West through interrupted traffic routes, slower traffic times, disruption with public transport, interruption with businesses and loss of connections across communities. This finding highlights the need for a proper cost benefit analysis for the project. Such social costs should not simply be dismissed with the promise of a construction plan into which the community has not input or powers to enforce.
- I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>MAX ICEATINGE</u>
	Address: <u>6/169 LIVINGSTONE ROAD</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>MARRICKVILLE</u> Postcode <u>2204</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>a) There is no statement on the level of accuracy and reliability of the traffic modelling process. This is a major shortcoming and is contrary to the Secretary's Environmental Assessments Requirements. Westconnex traffic modelling relies on implausible traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the road links and intersections at several key locations.</p> <p>b) The great number of heritage houses in the Rozelle interchange construction zone has not been specifically addressed. Noise and vibration impacts can have far more significant impacts on these types of properties. There is no functional management plan for these risks, no articulated complaints investigation process nor any articulated compensation and remediation strategy.</p> <p>c) This is despite the RMS being the client for the Sydney Motorways Corporation. It would appear this is a deliberate strategy of the NSW Government to ensure local communities affected by construction traffic have no reasonable means of managing any complaint. It is undemocratic, against the principles of open government espoused in the election platform of the current government and ultimately escalates community unrest.(P 8-44)</p> | <p>d) The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)</p> <p>e) I object strongly to AECOM's approach to heritage. The methodology used is simply to describe heritage. If it interrupts the project plans, it simply must be destroyed. This is not an assessment at all. Plans to salvage items do have value but this value should not be used as a carrot to justify the removal of buildings.</p> <p>f) The traffic modelling process is not fit for purpose and places significant risks on the people of NSW in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traffic impacts that are significantly different to those presented in the EIS. ○ Toll earnings that are significantly lower than projections – resulting in government subsidising the owner for lost earnings. <p>g) The project objectives (Part 3.3 of EIS) include enabling the construction of motorways over the harbour and to the northern beaches. However, the traffic impacts of these motorways in Rozelle have not been assessed. These projects were not part of the business case that justified the WestConnex in the first place. This constant shifting of reasoning as to why the project is justified points to a</p> |
|---|--|

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: MAX LEATIME

Signature: 

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 6 / 169 LE VINGSTONE ROAD

Suburb: MARRICKVILLE

Postcode: 2204

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- 1) The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)
- 2) The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement
- 3) Worker parking – Leichhardt. There is provision in the EIS for only a dozen worker car parks and no provision for the 100 or so workers who will be permanently based at the Darley Road site for up to five years. A major construction site project should not be permitted in a neighbourhood area without allocated parking for all workers. No other business would be permitted to be established without this requirement being satisfied – why is it acceptable for this project? In addition, the EIS proposes the removal of 20 car spaces used by residents on Darley Road and will remove the 'kiss and ride' facility at the light rail stop. This will result in residents being unable to park in their own street and will increase noise impacts from workers doing shift changeovers 24 hours a day.
- 4) The removal of spoil from the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to the largest number of spoil truck movements on the entire Stage 3 project: 517 Heavy truck movements a day, of which 46 are stated to take place during peak hours. This will lead to extra noise and air pollution in this area.
- 5) The money spent on this stage could have been spent on modernizing the railway signal system so the train service could be improved which would benefit the communities west of Parramatta. What commuters out west really need is an extension of the heavy rail train system. I object that we were never given a choice about it.
- 6) The accuracy of the traffic modelling outputs can only be as good as the accuracy of the inputs. Projections of key inputs relating to population and employment become very unreliable beyond 10 or 15 years. In addition to this, the transport sector is facing a potentially significant disruption from connected, automated vehicles that may have a significant impact on traffic growth. This has not been considered or modelled.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning
Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

MAX KEATINGE

Signature:

[Handwritten Signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

6/169 LIVINGSTONE ROAD.

Suburb:

MARRICKVILLE Postcode 2204.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

- A. I am concerned that while the EIS finds that tolls do weigh more heavily on lower income motorists, there is no serious analysis of the blatant unfairness of letting of private consortium toll people for decades in order to pay for less profitable tollways for wealthier communities.
- B. The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. In relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.
- C. I am concerned that the AECOM, the company responsible for the EIS, always approves knocking down heritage buildings if the project requires it. It doesn't how much value it holds for the community, it must always be destroyed.
- D. Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downplays concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. The raises the question of whether this is a result of the failure of SMC to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters about the potential impacts of the M4
- M5
- E. Many homes around the Rozelle Rail Yards and the Crescent Civil site will be noise affected, some will be highly noise affected. The expected duration of the cumulative works is 120 weeks, almost 3 years, when noise impact will be significant so it is essential that maximum noise mitigation measures are put in place. However the EIS contains only vague details of how mitigation will be carried out. There is no requirement that measures will in fact be carried out to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain specific noise mitigation measures, that can be mandated and enforced. Areas that will be particularly highly noise affected are Bayview Crescent and Railway Parade, the Northern end of Rail Yard site and sections of Lilyfield Rd, Hornsey St, Quirk St and Robert St. Given their proximity, receivers located along Lilyfield Rd between Victoria Road and Gordon St which overlook the Rozelle Yards are likely to experience the greatest construction noise impact within the whole Rozelle area.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485


Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

THOMAS GUETIN

Signature:



Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

2 DARLEY ST

Suburb:

MONTMAY

Postcode

2042

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- ◆ Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.
- ◆ The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' Therefore this entire process is a sham as the extent to which concerns are taken into account is not known as the contractor can simply make further changes. As the contractor is not bound to take into account community impacts outside of the strict requirements and as the contractor will be trying to deliver the project as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is likely that the additional measure proposed with respect to construction noise mitigation for (example) will not be adopted. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS is riddled with caveats and lacks clear obligations and requirements for project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail.
- ◆ It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.
- ◆ There has been no 'meaningful' consultation with the community. Some areas affected by M3/M5 have not even been letterboxed by SMC. These include St Peters and sections of Erskineville. The SMC received hundreds of submissions on its concept design and failed to respond to any of these before lodging this EIS.
- ◆ The substation and water treatment plant should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link. This will mean that the site is less visible to residents and most pedestrian access is at this end. There are no homes that will have direct line of sight of the facility if it is moved. This will also enable direct pedestrian access to the light rail without the need to use the winding path at the rear of the site which creates safety issues and adds to the time required to access the light rail stop.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

<p>Attention Director Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Katrina Barker</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>[Signature]</u></p> <p>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>418 King Street</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Newtown</u> Postcode <u>2042</u></p>
---	---

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- ❖ I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.
- ❖ I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.
- ❖ Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)
- ❖ Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. There is however a caveat - the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.
- ❖ I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.
- ❖ I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Annabelle McEwen</i>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <i>24 Manton Avenue</i>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <i>Newington</i>	Postcode <i>2127</i>
	Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.
- The social and economic impact study fails to record the great concern for valued Newtown heritage
- The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.
- The consultants for the Social and Economic Impact study is HillPDA. This company has a conflict of interest and is not an appropriate choice to do a social impact study of WestCONnex. Amongst its services it offers property valuation services and promotes property development in what are perceived to be strategic locations. HillPDA were heavily involved in work leading to the development of Urban Growth NSW and the heavily criticised Parramatta Rd Study. It is not in the public interest to use public funds on an EIS done by a company that has such a heavy stake in property development opportunities along the Parramatta Rd corridor. One of the advantages of property development along Parramatta Rd that Hill PDA promotes on its website is the 33 kilometre WestCONnex.
- The EIS acknowledges that extra construction traffic will add to travel times across the Inner West and have a negative impact on businesses in the area. No compensation is suggested. These impacts are not been taken into account of evaluating the cost of WestCONnex.
- The EIS acknowledges that 'rat running' by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.
- The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.
- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Annabelle McEwen</i>
	Address: <i>24 Manton Avenue</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Newington</i> Postcode <i>2127</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The latest EIS was released just ten business days after feedback period ended for the Concept Design for the M4/M5 and before preliminary drilling to establish a route through the Inner West is completed. **WHAT IS THE RUSH?** This EIS is little more than a concept design and is far less developed than earlier ones. It is composed of many indicate only plans such that it is impossible to know what the impacts will be and yet approval is being sought in a rush. The EIS ignores more than 1500 submissions, including one of 142 pages from the Inner West Council.
- One toll road leads to another 3 being proposed. The EIS's for the M4 East and the New M5 argued the case that serious congestion created near interchanges would be solved once the M4/M5 was built. Now it seems this is not the case and more roads will be needed to relieve the congestion – **WHERE DOES THIS END?** According to the M4/M5 EIS the real benefits will depend on building the Western Harbour Tunnel, the Airport Link and a tollway heading South. None of these projects have been planned, let alone approved but yet are part of addressing the congestion impacts acknowledged for the M4/M5link project. Given this how is it possible to know or address the impacts of the M4/M5 Link, unless this is just yet more justification for yet more roads?
- Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. **WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.**
- Where is the commitment to community consultation and to long term planning when the EIS for the M4/M5 Link is released before any response to the extensive community feedback on the M4-M5 Link concept design could possibly have been seriously considered. This demonstrates deep government contempt for the people of NSW and the communities of the Inner West of Sydney in particular.
- The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.
- For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: Catherine Vungkhorn

Signature: [Signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 22 25-35A Park Rd

Suburb: Granville Postcode: 2220

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- i. The EIS admits that drivers from lower income households are more likely to travel longer distances to avoid tolls because of the cost. So you either pay the high tolls (capped at \$7.95 in 2015 dollars) or you drive for longer to avoid the tolls. We have seen this already where commuters have chose to drive on Parramatta rd not the new M4 with the new tolls. This is unfair.
- ii. In order to make the model work, traffic that exceeds the free flow capacity of the network was reassigned to hours outside of the peak – i.e. the model assumes people shift the time they travel. However, the potential of shifting journey times to reduce overall traffic demand is not considered.
- iii. The traffic modelling approach applied in the EIS is commonly used in NSW. This approach has proven to be flawed. Infrastructure Australia compared predicted and actual traffic levels and found that the assumed steady growth in traffic did not occur. In Sydney, urban congestion levels are growing at around one third of the forecast rate. (See Figure 1, below)
- iv. SMC is using an unpublished Value of Travel Time in the Westconnex traffic modelling. If the Value of Travel Time adopted is incorrect, then all outputs will be incorrect.
- v. The construction impact of the future Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link entry and exit ramps connecting to City West Link/The Crescent has been assessed. The operational traffic impact of these ramps has not. This should be completed and publicly released before determination. There is no verifiable or understandable data to determine the veracity of claims of traffic generated by these other links.
- vi. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1,000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity. I object to the push for the M4-M5 link when there are still no plans for the Sydney Gateway to deal with the increased traffic.
- vii. The EIS states that a Construction Traffic and Access Management Plan (CTAMP) "would be developed in consultation with local Councils and stakeholders associated with public facilities adjacent to project site". A similar commitment was made for construction of the New M5. It has been poorly managed. There is limited response to Council input and the Sydney Motorway Corporation and Roads and Maritime Services each deny responsibility and blame each other for a lack of action.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: C. Menonitis

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 7 Albermarle St.

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link


- ❖ Night works – Leichhardt. The EIS states that to minimize disruptions to traffic on the existing road network (including in peak hours) there will be night works where appropriate. Given the congested nature of Darley Road, it is likely there will be frequent night work (EIS, 6.4). This will create an unacceptable impact in residents. It is unacceptable that a highly unsuitable site has been selected. And, instead of a proper plan to manage traffic, the EIS contemplate work simply occurring at night. This is objected to in the strongest terms.
- ❖ The removal of Buruwan Park between The Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Parade, Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a direct loss of much-needed parkland in this inner city area. Further, Buruwan Park lies on a major cycle route from Railway Parade through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD.
- ❖ There will be 100 workers a day on the site, with provision for only 10-20 car spaces and there is a concession that local streets will be used, who will be 'encouraged' to use public transport. Our experience with the major construction sites in Haberfield, and St Peters that public transport is not used by the workers and that despite the fact they are not supposed to do so, they park in our local streets and cause strife with our residents.
- ❖ The EIS admits that air pollutants will exceed permitted levels along the Canal Rd used to access the St Peters Interchange because the traffic will be heavier. This is an unacceptable impact which will adversely affect vehicle users because it is known

that people in their vehicles are not protected from the air pollution, as well as anyone on foot or cycling in the streets around the interchange. No amelioration is offered.

- ❖ The EIS states that investigation would be undertaken to confirm whether the Victoria Road bridge is a potential roost site for microbats. There will be attempts to 'manage potential impacts' if confirmed. This is inadequate. The project should not be permitted to impact on vulnerable species.
- ❖ I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.
- ❖ I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

<p>Attention Director Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Matthew Grech</u></p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>7201 177-21a Mitchell Rd</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Erskineville</u> Postcode: <u>2043</u></p>
---	---

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- A. THE LATEST EIS WAS RELEASED JUST TEN BUSINESS DAYS AFTER FEEDBACK PERIOD ENDED FOR THE CONCEPT DESIGN FOR THE M4/M5 AND BEFORE PRELIMINARY DRILLING TO ESTABLISH A ROUTE THROUGH THE INNER WEST IS COMPLETED. WHAT IS THE RUSH? THIS EIS IS LITTLE MORE THAN A CONCEPT DESIGN AND IS FAR LESS DEVELOPED THAN EARLIER ONES. IT IS COMPOSED OF MANY INDICATE ONLY PLANS SUCH THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO KNOW WHAT THE IMPACTS WILL BE AND YET APPROVAL IS BEING SOUGHT IN A RUSH. THE EIS IGNORES MORE THAN 1500 SUBMISSIONS, INCLUDING ONE OF 142 PAGES FROM THE INNER WEST COUNCIL.
- B. ONE TOLL ROAD LEADS TO ANOTHER 3 BEING PROPOSED. THE EIS'S FOR THE M4 EAST AND THE NEW M5 ARGUED THE CASE THAT SERIOUS CONGESTION CREATED NEAR INTERCHANGES WOULD BE SOLVED ONCE THE M4/M5 WAS BUILT. NOW IT SEEMS THIS IS NOT THE CASE AND MORE ROADS WILL BE NEEDED TO RELIEVE THE CONGESTION – WHERE DOES THIS END? ACCORDING TO THE M4/M5 EIS THE REAL BENEFITS WILL DEPEND ON BUILDING THE WESTERN HARBOUR TUNNEL, THE AIRPORT LINK AND A TOLLWAY HEADING SOUTH. NONE OF THESE PROJECTS HAVE BEEN PLANNED, LET ALONE APPROVED BUT YET ARE PART OF ADDRESSING THE CONGESTION IMPACTS ACKNOWLEDGED FOR THE M4/M5 LINK PROJECT. GIVEN THIS HOW IS IT POSSIBLE TO KNOW OR ADDRESS THE IMPACTS OF THE M4/M5 LINK, UNLESS THIS IS JUST YET MORE JUSTIFICATION FOR YET MORE ROADS?
- C. RESEARCH ABOUT ROADS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATES THAT ROADS CREATE CONGESTION. THE WESTCONNEX PROJECT IS NO DIFFERENT AND THE EIS CLEARLY INDICATES THAT THIS IS AN IMPACT OF THE M4/M5 AND THE CONSEQUENT ROADS THAT WILL FOLLOW. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE M4/M5 LINK EIS ITSELF INDICATES THE RMS IS ALREADY HARD AT WORK CONSIDERING HOW TO SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS – OF CONGESTION CAUSED BY ROADS.
- D. WHERE IS THE COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND TO LONG TERM PLANNING WHEN THE EIS FOR THE M4/M5 LINK IS RELEASED BEFORE ANY RESPONSE TO THE EXTENSIVE COMMUNITY FEEDBACK ON THE M4-M5 LINK CONCEPT DESIGN COULD POSSIBLY HAVE BEEN SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED. THIS DEMONSTRATES DEEP GOVERNMENT CONTEMPT FOR THE PEOPLE OF NSW AND THE COMMUNITIES OF THE INNER WEST OF SYDNEY IN PARTICULAR.
- E. THE EIS WAS PREPARED BY GLOBAL ENGINEERING FIRM AECOM, WHICH ALSO PREPARED THE EIS FOR STAGES 1 AND 2. WHEN HE APPROVED THESE EARLIER STAGES, THE THEN MINISTER FOR PLANNING ROB STOKES POINTED TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THAT WOULD MINIMISE IMPACTS ON COMMUNITIES. BUT THE IMPACTS HAVE TURNED OUT TO WORSE THAN EXPECTED.
- F. FOR EXAMPLE, THE AECOM EIS FOR THE NEW M5 FAILED TO DEAL WITH HOW THE MASSIVELY CONTAMINATED LAND FILL AT ALEXANDRIA WOULD BE MANAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION. AFTER MONTHS OF SICKENING ODOURS, THE NSW EPA ADMITS THAT DESPITE FINING SMC AND REQUIRING CONTRACTORS TO TAKE MEASURES TO CONTROL ODOURS, THEY HAVE NOT STOPPED. IT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT IT DOES NOT HAVE THE POWER TO STOP WORK UNTIL WESTCONNEX CONTRACTORS COMPLY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485


Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Despina Korfatis

Signature:



Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

12 Whitehorse St,

Suburb:

NEWTOWN

Postcode

2042

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- o The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.
- o The EIS at 12-57 describes possible disruptions of water supply to a vast area of Sydney as a result of tunnelling in the proximity of two major Sydney Water Tunnels in the Newtown area, stating "Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water Assets". Why has an EIS been published that infers that the tunnel alignments have been thoroughly surveyed and researched, when further survey work could dramatically alter the alignments in the future ?
- o The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.
- o The assessment and solution to potentially serious problems described in the EIS at 12-57 (where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs) is "based on assumptions about the strength and stiffness of the water tunnels given that limited information about the design and condition of these assets was available. Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water assets. A detailed assessment would be carried out in consultation with Sydney Water to demonstrate that construction of the M4-M5 Link tunnels would have negligible adverse settlement or vibration impacts on these tunnels. A settlement monitoring program would also be implemented during construction to validate or reassess the predictions should it be required." The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- o It all very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: MARK INGHAM

Signature: M. W. Ingham

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 36/2 GOODWIN ST

Suburb: KAWBAROO POINT Postcode: 4169

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments


Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- Truck routes – Leichhardt: No trucks should be permitted on Darley Road or local roads in Leichhardt or Lilyfield. The EIS proposes that all trucks will arrive at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site from Haberfield and travel along Darley Road to the site, with a right-hand turn now permitted into James Street. The proposed route will result in a truck every 3-4 minutes for 5 years running directly by the small houses on Darley Road. These homes will not be habitable during the five-year construction period due to the unacceptable noise impacts. The truck noise will be worsened by their need to travel up a steep hill to return to the City West Link, so the noise impacts will affect not just those homes on or immediately adjacent to Darley Road. The proposal to run trucks so close to homes is dangerous and there have been two fatalities on Darley Road at the proposed site location. The EIS does not propose any noise or safety barriers to address this. Despite the unacceptable impact to nearby homes, there is no proposal for noise walls, nor any mitigation to individual homes.
- Noise mitigation – Leichhardt. The noise mitigation proposed in the EIS is unacceptable. No detail of noise walls is provided, giving residents no opportunity to comment on whether final impacts are acceptable. This is despite the fact 36 homes are identified in the EIS as severely affected by construction noise. The acoustic shed proposed is of the lowest grade and does not cover the entire site, resulting in noise impacts from the movement of trucks in and out of the tunnel access point. The highest grade acoustic shed should be provided, with the shed covering the entire site. The additional noise mitigation such as noise walls, need to be set out in detail so that residents can properly comment on the impacts.
- I am concerned that the AECOM, the company responsible for the EIS, always approves knocking down heritage buildings if the project requires it. It doesn't how much value it holds for the community, it must always be destroyed.
- The decision to build a three-stage tollway instead of expanding public transport has never been subjected to democratic decision-making and in fact has been opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages.
- I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project, There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Peters and Haberfield or Rozelle, all traffic going to the CBD, East or into the Inner West will use local roads.
- The proposal for a permanent water treatment plant and substation to the south of the site on Darley Road will prevent direct pedestrian access to the light rail station. It will affect the future uses of the site once the project is completed. The facility is out of step with the area which is comprised of low rise homes and detracts from the visual amenity of the area. This site is a pedestrian hub and will be a visual blight for pedestrians, bike users and the homes that have direct line of sight to the facility. It should not be permitted on this site.


Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Felicia Puteri</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u></u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>3 Eve Street</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Erskineville</u> Postcode: <u>2043</u>	

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application.**

- ◆ Rozelle Rail Yards and Rozelle Civil Site. It is clear that the most highly affected area of Stage 3 will be the Rozelle area and the massive and hugely complex Rozelle interchange. The suggestion that Westconnex is capable of building this is highly questionable. Nothing like this has been built anywhere else in the World. Considering the simple problems of dust management, noxious gasses and the handling of toxic materials like asbestos that have been so inappropriately dealt with on Stages 1 and 2 by Westconnex this intersection of Stage 3 is a disaster waiting to happen and should definitely not be allowed to proceed without a massive investigation. What has been shown in the EIS is totally inadequate for this project to be allowed to proceed.
- ◆ The proposed work hours for the Rozelle Rail Yards are tunnelling and spoil handling 24 hours a day seven days a week. Civil construction Mon - Fri 7.00am – 6.00pm, Sat 8.00am -1.00 pm. There will be no night work at The Crescent Civil Site and the daytime hours are stated to be the same as at the Rozelle Rail Yards. However as has been experienced by those at Haberfield and St Peters these hours and especially late and night work have been extended and implemented when the schedule has fallen behind and this has lead to physical and mental stress for many residents through interrupted sleep and loss of sleep especially with children. The roads and sites at night in the area will see a marked increase in noise from truck movements, truck reversing alarms and running machinery. It will also see a marked increase in light during the night hours with site illumination and vehicle head lights as has been experienced in other areas. These problems have not been properly addressed and are not adequately dealt with in the EIS.
- ◆ The tunnels under Rozelle/Lilyfield are going to be in three levels. The EIS does not explain what safety procedures are being built into the project to deal with situations like serious congestion, accidents or fire. With a serious hold up on the deepest of these tunnels it is clear that the air quality will very quickly become toxic unless substantial air conditioning is a major part of the design. There is no in depth detail about how these issues are going to be addressed. This is not acceptable.
- ◆ One of the main reasons for establishing Buruwan Park was as a relatively quiet nature corridor for wildlife not for successions of children's parties so the assessment of this area in the EIS is entirely blinkered and inaccurate. The Rozelle Rail Yards site that may appear to development driven planners as an unattractive and wasted eyesore is ironically a very important nature reserve. It is perhaps the only area in the Annandale/Glebe area where Fairy Wrens can be found because of the substantial bush cover. This is very important as where these birds are found nature tends to be in balance which is not the case in parks like Easton Park and Bicentennial Park.

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Eenwal Seal</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: 	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>19 Robert Street</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>St Peters</u> Postcode: <u>2044</u>	

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- FOR THE CONCEPT DESIGN FOR THE M4/M5 AND BEFORE PRELIMINARY DRILLING TO ESTABLISH A ROUTE THROUGH THE INNER WEST IS COMPLETED. WHAT IS THE RUSH? THIS EIS IS LITTLE MORE THAN A CONCEPT DESIGN AND IS FAR LESS DEVELOPED THAN EARLIER ONES. IT IS COMPOSED OF MANY INDICATE ONLY PLANS SUCH THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO KNOW WHAT THE IMPACTS WILL BE AND YET APPROVAL IS BEING SOUGHT IN A RUSH. THE EIS IGNORES MORE THAN 1500 SUBMISSIONS, INCLUDING ONE OF 142 PAGES FROM THE INNER WEST COUNCIL.
- B. ONE TOLL ROAD LEADS TO ANOTHER 3 BEING PROPOSED. THE EIS'S FOR THE M4 EAST AND THE NEW M5 ARGUED THE CASE THAT SERIOUS CONGESTION CREATED NEAR INTERCHANGES WOULD BE SOLVED ONCE THE M4/M5 WAS BUILT. NOW IT SEEMS THIS IS NOT THE CASE AND MORE ROADS WILL BE NEEDED TO RELIEVE THE CONGESTION – WHERE DOES THIS END? ACCORDING TO THE M4/M5 EIS THE REAL BENEFITS WILL DEPEND ON BUILDING THE WESTERN HARBOUR TUNNEL, THE AIRPORT LINK AND A TOLLWAY HEADING SOUTH. NONE OF THESE PROJECTS HAVE BEEN PLANNED, LET ALONE APPROVED BUT YET ARE PART OF ADDRESSING THE CONGESTION IMPACTS ACKNOWLEDGED FOR THE M4/M5 LINK PROJECT. GIVEN THIS HOW IS IT POSSIBLE TO KNOW OR ADDRESS THE IMPACTS OF THE M4/M5 LINK, UNLESS THIS IS JUST YET MORE JUSTIFICATION FOR YET MORE ROADS?
- C. RESEARCH ABOUT ROADS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATES THAT ROADS CREATE CONGESTION. THE WESTCONNEX PROJECT IS NO DIFFERENT AND THE EIS CLEARLY INDICATES THAT THIS IS AN IMPACT OF THE M4/M5 AND THE CONSEQUENT ROADS THAT WILL FOLLOW. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE M4/M5 LINK
- EIS ITSELF INDICATES THE RMS IS ALREADY HARD AT WORK CONSIDERING HOW TO SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS – OF CONGESTION CAUSED BY ROADS.
- D. WHERE IS THE COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND TO LONG TERM PLANNING WHEN THE EIS FOR THE M4/M5 LINK IS RELEASED BEFORE ANY RESPONSE TO THE EXTENSIVE COMMUNITY FEEDBACK ON THE M4-M5 LINK CONCEPT DESIGN COULD POSSIBLY HAVE BEEN SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED. THIS DEMONSTRATES DEEP GOVERNMENT CONTEMPT FOR THE PEOPLE OF NSW AND THE COMMUNITIES OF THE INNER WEST OF SYDNEY IN PARTICULAR.
- E. THE EIS WAS PREPARED BY GLOBAL ENGINEERING FIRM AECOM, WHICH ALSO PREPARED THE EIS FOR STAGES 1 AND 2. WHEN HE APPROVED THESE EARLIER STAGES, THE THEN MINISTER FOR PLANNING ROB STOKES POINTED TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THAT WOULD MINIMISE IMPACTS ON COMMUNITIES. BUT THE IMPACTS HAVE TURNED OUT TO WORSE THAN EXPECTED.
- F. FOR EXAMPLE, THE AECOM EIS FOR THE NEW M5 FAILED TO DEAL WITH HOW THE MASSIVELY CONTAMINATED LAND FILL AT ALEXANDRIA WOULD BE MANAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION. AFTER MONTHS OF SICKENING ODOURS, THE NSW EPA ADMITS THAT DESPITE FINING SMC AND REQUIRING CONTRACTORS TO TAKE MEASURES TO CONTROL ODOURS, THEY HAVE NOT STOPPED. IT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT IT DOES NOT HAVE THE POWER TO STOP WORK UNTIL WESTCONNEX CONTRACTORS COMPLY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Chee Hen LEE

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 77 MacQuarrie Rd

Suburb: Auburn Postcode: 2146

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- a) Increased traffic on local roads will decrease residential amenity and decrease the potential for new higher density housing. This will affect numerous streets, with particularly major impacts on The Crescent, Minogue Crescent, Ross, Mount Vernon, Catherine, Ross and Arundel streets in Glebe; and Euston Road, McEvoy, Botany, Wyndham, Bourke and Lachlan Streets in the Green Square area. In the redevelopment areas, land adjoining these streets may suffer a loss of development potential, a loss of value and will bear the additional costs of designing for noisy environments.
- b) The EIS admits that the people who live in western Sydney have lower incomes than in the inner suburbs and that the tolls will therefore be a heavier cost in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, Blacktown or Wetherill Park than in Strathfield or Padstow. This is unfair when the benefits of Stage 3 are all for north-south connections to the northern beaches or the proposed new harbour tunnel.
- c) The EIS provides traffic projections for the 'With Project' scenario and 'cumulative' scenario (which in addition to links in the 'With Project' scenario includes the Beaches Link and F6 motorway connections), but when referencing the traffic benefits/impacts in the early sections, the EIS appears to cite the 'with project' scenario rather than Cumulative Scenario. It is unclear which scenarios the Business Case best reflects.
- d) The modelling makes no mention of bus lanes on Victoria Rd. If these lanes were not modelled as car lanes the assumed capacity of the road is incorrect.
- e) The high tolls are set to increase for decades by the CPI or by 4% a year, whichever is higher. When inflation is low and wages are not even keeping up with low inflation this is outrageous. And it is not as if the commuters or workers of western Sydney have a real alternative in public transport. This is just gouging western Sydney road users to make the road attractive to a buyer
- f) The EIS admits that drivers from lower income households are more likely to travel longer distances to avoid tolls because of the cost. So you either pay the high tolls (capped at \$7.95 in 2015 dollars) or you drive for longer to avoid the tolls. We have seen this already where commuters have chose to drive on Parramatta rd not the new M4 with the new tolls. This is unfair.
- g) The 2023 'cumulative' modelling scenario includes the Sydney Gateway and the western harbour tunnel but neither of these projects are currently committed and it is highly unlikely they will be completed by this date. This raises the question of why did the proponent adopt such a misleading position and how does it affect the impacts stated?
- h) This EIS contains no meaningful design and construction details and no parameters as to how broad changes and therefore impacts could be. It therefore fails to allow the community to be informed about and comment on the project impacts in a meaningful way.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: BRANDY HOLLAND
 Signature: Brandy Holland

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 76/3 WILLIAMS PDE
 Suburb: DULWICH HILL Postcode: 2203

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

1. The EIS states that after the M4-M5 opens, that traffic on Darley Road will increase by 4%. There is no benefit in the overall project for residents. During construction westbound traffic will increase on Darley Road by 37%. This increase in traffic for a period of up to five years will make it hazardous to cross the road and access the light rail and travel to Blackmore oval, the bat run, the dog park and the Leichhardt pool. In addition, it will drastically increase both local traffic and outer area traffic at peak commute times. We therefore object to the location of this site based on the unacceptable traffic impacts it will have on road users and on residents.
2. I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. The government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.
3. The EIS was released just 12 days after the closing date for submissions to the Concept Design. This categorically proves that all the Community Consultations and Submissions to the Concept Design were a total sham. There were at least 800 posts on the interactive map. These were limited as the community only had 140 characters available to make their point which was woefully inadequate. But there were at least 1500 written submissions, some of which were highly detailed and of considerable length. There is no way that all these submissions could have been read, considered, their arguments integrated into the EIS and then for the EIS of 7200 pages to be put together, printed and released 12 days after the the closing date for submissions to the Concept Design. There needs to be a major investigation into this flagrant abuse of the way NSW planning laws have been flouted for the whole of Westconnex and particularly Stage 3.
4. Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. There must be a review of the NSW government's unacceptable policy on this issue. I am appalled that the ex Minister for Planning Rob Stokes who approved the New M5 and unfiltered stacks in St Peters and Haberfield would declare that he would not have them in his own area. How can residents have any trust in a process that is underpinned by such hypocrisy.
5. Targets for renewable energy and carbon offsets are not aligned with NSW government policy. (Table 22-8)
6. The operational Green House Gas (GHG) assessment is based on the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3). This model has major flaws and the unreliable outputs of the model put into question the GHG assessment.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: Bronwyn Holland

Signature: Bronwyn Holland

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 76/3 WILLIAMS PDE

Suburb: DULWICH HILL Postcode: 2203

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport
Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

1. 2 G Appendix P Table 5-27 of the EIS states that 43% of the Leichhardt- Glebe Precinct travel to work by Car, 21% by Bus and 5% by Rail. These are figures for 2011. These figures are being used to promote the project and suggest they are accurate today. In the case of Rail these figures are extremely questionable. The Light Rail is now hugely popular, it's use having grown enormously. It is travelling at full capacity at Peak hours. More services are being put in place. Apartment blocks are being built as close to the Light Rail corridor as possible. Residents see the Light Rail as an efficient, reliable and timely method of commuting to work. It is blatantly obvious that the Govt should be investing heavily in building and extending Light Rail, Metro and Rail. If this were pursued in a professional manner the necessity for trying to hoodwink the community into believing that Westconnex were needed would be totally unnecessary.
2. The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.
3. Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces provided for workers(EIS). The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately 550. This means that 150 vehicles will need to park in nearby local streets which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.
4. There will be increases of noise in the area of Johnston St where traffic volumes will increase. Residents will be more susceptible to health impacts associated with increased noise. In the EIS it is stated that residents may have to keep their windows closed. They may well experience sleep disturbance and interference of living activities like eating outdoors. However the EIS considers this to be only moderately negative. This is not acceptable.
5. I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.
6. For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.
7. Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: BRAWYN HOLLAND

Signature: Brawyn Holland

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 76/3 WILLIAMS POE

Suburb: DULWICH HILL Postcode: 2203

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- I. Recently Andrew Constance has been quoted numerous times promoting his vision of the transport future and some of these views are aired in the EIS but the vision put forward is highly visionary with no practical detail addressing how these changes are going to be brought about and so they are totally unrealistic. For example it is starting to be commonly accepted that car manufacturers will be reducing production of petrol/diesel cars before 2040 probably starting in 2030. It is proposed that electric cars will then take over. It is suggested that cars will be charged over night at people's homes. Virtually no one in the Inner City Suburbs has a garage. Are all the streets throughout all the suburbs going to be fitted out with charging points outside all the houses, similar to parking meters? We have all watched the shambles of the rolling out of the NBN it would be mind blowing to watch what would happen with the rolling out of charging points to each household without a garage and it would take years to achieve. There are virtually no recharging points at any Fuel Stations anywhere as yet and to set these up will take years. A large part of the population run older cars, because that is all they are able to afford. It will take many years for these petrol/diesel cars to disappear. Andrew Constance has also said that when everyone is driving an autonomous car average speeds will be reduced but as they are not being controlled by individual drivers this will mean they will be able to travel much closer together and so there will not be so much delay caused by spread out congestion. If this is to be so perhaps the suggestion could be made that some mechanism could be employed which would enable these cars to link together; if that could be done then they could form -a TRAIN - and then really travel at speed!
- II. The decision to build a three-stage tollway instead of expanding public transport has never been subjected to democratic decision-making and in fact has been opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages.
- III. We object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that it provides for daily movements of 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road. This creates an unacceptable risk to the safety of pedestrians accessing the North Leichhardt light rail stop as well as bicycle users accessing the bicycle route on Darley Road and entering Canal road to join the dedicated bike paths on the bay run. Many school children cross at this point to walk to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College. The EIS states that an alternative truck movement is proposed which involves use of the City West Link with no trucks to access Darley Road. The selection of Darley Road should not be approved if it involves any truck movements on Darley Road, which is what it currently provides.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: BRAUN HOLLAND

Signature: Braun Holland

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 76/3 WILLIAMS PDE

Suburb: DULLICH HILL Postcode: 2203

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

1. Alternative access route for trucks - Leichhardt: The EIS states that there are 'investigations' occurring into alternative access to the Darley Road site. The EIS does not provide any detail on which residents can comment about alternative access which would keep trucks off Darley Road. The plans for alternative access should be expedited. It should be a condition of approval that the alternative access is confirmed and that no spoil trucks are permitted to access Darley Road due to the unacceptable noise, safety and traffic issues that the current proposal creates
2. I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.
3. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1,000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity.
4. Where is the commitment to community consultation and to long term planning when the EIS for the M4/M5 Link is released before any response to the extensive community feedback on the M4-M5 Link concept design could possibly have been seriously considered. This demonstrates deep government contempt for the people of NSW and the communities of the Inner West of Sydney in particular.
5. The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.
6. There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name B Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning
Services,Department of Planning and
Environment

GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:

WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: **BROWN HOLLAND**Signature: **Brown Holland**Please
include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT
made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.Address: **76/3 WILLIAMS FDE**Suburb: **DULWICH Hill**Postcode **2203**

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

1. Along with the widening of the Crescent at Annandale the White's Creek bridge is to be rebuilt. This will mean that the road in this area will be reduced in width as first one side of the bridge is rebuilt followed by the other. Added to the additional volume of trucks from the Rozelle Rail Yards, the Crescent Civil site and the Camperdown site this is going to lead to massive congestion on Johnston St and all along the Crescent towards Ross St and make it virtually impossible for residents to exit and return to their local area. It is most likely that the commercial sectors of the Tramsheds development will be badly affected.
2. The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.
3. The Inner West Greenway was considered but not assessed as a cumulative impact. One of the claimed project benefits of the proposal is improved east/west crossings of Parramatta Rd for pedestrians/bikes and the Greenway would achieve this and should be assessed and provided as part of the project. The Greenway was part of inner west LR project before it was deferred in 2011 and Inner West Council has done extensive work on it.
4. Human health risk (Executive Summary xvi) - The EIS states that there may be a 'small increase in pollutant concentrations' near surface roads. The EIS states that potential health impacts associated with changes in air quality (specifically nitrogen dioxide and particulates) within the local community have been assessed and are considered to be 'acceptable.' We disagree that the impacts on human health are acceptable and object to the project in its entirety because of these impacts.
5. At the western end of Bignell Lane near Pyrmont Bridge Road existing flood depth was identified up to one metre in the 100 year ARI. The NSW Government Floodplain Development Manual (2005) identifies this location as a high flood hazard area.
6. The EIS states the Inner West Interchange would be under 3 suburbs - Lilyfield, Annandale and Leichhardt - so clearly it would cover a very extensive area (see map in EIS Vol 1A Chap 5 Part 1 p11) with drilling and danger of subsidence affecting hundreds of homes.
7. The modelling has thousands of unreleased cars at key locations; i.e. in reality those unreleased vehicles would result in vehicle queues and or network failure.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: BRANDYN HOLLAND

Signature: Brandy Holland

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 16/13 WILLIAMS POE

Suburb: DULWICH HILL Postcode: 2203

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

1. Crash statistics – City West Link and James St intersection. The EIS only analyses crash statistics near the interchanges. It does not provide any detail as to the number of crashes at the James St/City West Link intersection which, on Transport for NSW's own figures, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Nor does it comment on the two fatalities that occurred on Darley Road near the proposed construction site. The EIS needs to detail the increased risk in crashes that will be caused by the additional 170 vehicles a day that are proposed to enter and leave Darley Road during the construction period.
2. I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
3. The tunnels under Rozelle/Lilyfield are going to be in three levels. The EIS does not explain what safety procedures are being built into the project to deal with situations like serious congestion, accidents or fire. With a serious hold up on the deepest of these tunnels it is clear that the air quality will very quickly become toxic unless substantial air conditioning is a major part of the design. There is no in depth detail about how these issues are going to be addressed. This is not acceptable.
4. The TfNSW website says "The Sydney Metro West project is Sydney's next big railway infrastructure investment" but the Cumulative Impact assessment by AECOM (App C) does not include West Metro. A business case for West Metro should be completed before determination of the Project.
5. Emissions were not modelled beyond 2033. This is an omission, as the contractual life of the project is significantly longer, until 2060. The EIS states, on page 22-15 that 'it is expected that savings in emissions from improved road performance would reduce over time as traffic volumes increase'. Therefore, the longer-term outcome of the project is likely to be an increase in GHG emissions
6. Improving connectivity with public transport, including trains, light rail and bus services in the inner west would make the Parramatta Road corridor a more attractive place to live, work and socialise.
7. Given that the modelling for air quality is based on the traffic modelling, which, as shown above, is fundamentally flawed, and given poor air quality has a significant health impact the EIS should not be approved until an independent scientifically qualified reviewer has analysed the stated air quality outcomes and identified any deficits

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning
Services,Department of Planning and
Environment

GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:

WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Braun HollandSignature: Braun HollandPlease
include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT
made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.Address: 76/3 WILLIAMS PDESuburb: DULWICH HILLPostcode 2203

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

- a) A review of RMS traffic counts on numerous arterial routes within the 'sphere of influence' of the Project have shown no growth in traffic since 2006. During this period Sydney's population (as measured by the Greater Capital City Statistical Area) has grown at a rate of 1.5% per annum on average. Roads measured:
- Parramatta Rd at Ashfield (station 25002), Leichhardt (station 20012), Five Dock (station 30005) and Annandale
 - ANZAC Bridge (station 20001)
 - Anzac Parade Moore Park (station 03022 b/w 2008 and 2017)
 - Cleveland Street (station 03022)
 - Sydney Harbour Tunnel (station 01003)
 - O'Riordan Street (station 02309)
 - Sunnyholt Road Blacktown (station 69198)
 - General Holmes Drive Brighton-Le-Sands (station 23055)
 - King Georges Rd Roselands (station 24026)
- b) For example The St Peters / Sydney Park Interchange will overload the Mascot road network. As a result traffic levels were reduced to fit the modelling.
- c) It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.
- d) Rozelle Rail Yards and Rozelle Civil Site. It is clear that the most highly affected area of Stage 3 will be the Rozelle area and the massive and hugely complex Rozelle interchange. The suggestion that Westconnex is capable of building this is highly questionable. Nothing like this has been built anywhere else in the World. Considering the simple problems of dust management, noxious gasses and the handling of toxic materials like asbestos that have been so inappropriately dealt with on Stages 1 and 2 by Westconnex this intersection of Stage 3 is a disaster waiting to happen and should definitely not be allowed to proceed without a massive investigation. What has been shown in the EIS is totally inadequate for this project to be allowed to proceed.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Brown Holland

Signature: Brown Holland

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 16/3 WILLIAMS PDE

Suburb: DULWICH HILL Postcode: 2203

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

(1) Many students walk or ride to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College schools via Darley Road. There are also a number of childcare centres very close to the Darley Road site.

(2) There will be 100 workers a day on the site, with provision for only 10-20 car spaces and there is a concession that local streets will be used, who will be 'encouraged' to use public transport. Our experience with the major construction sites in Haberfield, and St Peters that public transport is not used by the workers and that despite the fact they are not supposed to do so, they park in our local streets and cause strife with our residents.

(3) I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4 East construction.

(4) The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in

the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other.

(5) It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With four unfiltered emissions stacks in the area plus a large number of exit portals, the residents of this area will suffer greatly from poisonous diesel particulates. This is negligent when you consider that, the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic." As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."

(6) The EIS states that traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange is expected to be worse after completion of the M5 and the M4-M5 Link particularly in the evening peak hour. The EIS admits that this will have a "moderate negative" impact on the neighbourhood in increasing pollution (also admitted separately) therefore in health impacts, on safety for foot and cycle traffic but also for vehicles and on the local amenity.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: Brown Holland

Signature: Brown Holland

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 76/3 WILLIAMS PDE

Suburb: DULWICH HILL Postcode: 2103

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- a) Both the St Peters Active Recreation Area and the Rozelle Interchange Open Space are a false promise. Unless there is an agreement for construction and management these will be grassed wastelands with compromised amenity, adjoined by ventilation facilities in Rozelle, divided by above ground portals and difficult to access across busy roads
- b) Scientists have found that there is no safe level of air pollution. As pollution levels rise deaths and hospitalisations rise too. A thorough cost-benefit analysis that takes into account the health effects due to increased exposure is required.
- c) The EIS admits that impacts of construction of the M4-M5 Link will worsen traffic on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it is outrageous for motorists to be asked already to pay up to up to \$20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.
- d) The modelling shows severe traffic levels and increased congestion on Johnston St, and The Crescent (+80% ADT).
- e) The high tolls are set to increase for decades by the CPI or by 4% a year, whichever is higher. When inflation is low and wages are not even keeping up with low inflation this is outrageous. And it is not as if the commuters or workers of western Sydney have a real alternative in public transport. This is just gouging western Sydney road users to make the road attractive to a buyer.
- f) SMC refuses to release the traffic model and detailed analysis for independent unpaid peer review and scenario analysis. The narrow boundaries of the areas of operational modelling mean the proponents have not fully assessed the Project's impacts on key strategic centres such as the Sydney Central Business District. It is not understood why a mesoscopic modelling approach was not undertaken to gain a better understanding of impacts to the surrounding road network.
- g) I object to this new tollway project because it will not reduce traffic, simply move it around. If they were serious about reducing traffic in Parramatta Rd they would put a toll on it and make the new roads free to encourage the traffic to use the new roads. They are doing the exact opposite, so the tolls don't seem to have anything to do with traffic management. And we have already see motorists abandoning the new M4 for Parramatta roads because the new tolls are so high
- h) The EIS narrowly defines congestion as 'traffic congestion' rather than delays to reliable and efficient access to human capital, goods and services which reduces economic activity and productivity. This results in an incorrect and misleading assessment.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____


Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Chloe Joyce</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <i>205 21-23 Enmore Rd</i> Suburb: <i>Newtown</i> Postcode <i>2042</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>
<p align="center">Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>A. Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.</p> | <p>to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.</p> |
| <p>B. Why are two different options being suggested for Haberfield? It is clear that both of these are unacceptable and will expose residents to unnecessary traffic danger, congestion and disruption with capacity to enjoy their homes and environment. It is insulting that the EIS acknowledges this but offers not solution other than to go ahead.</p> | <p>E. Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.</p> |
| <p>C. I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.</p> | <p>F. It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area, Rozelle</p> |
| <p>D. The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given</p> | <p>G. Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.</p> |
| | <p>H. A lot of work has gone into building cycling and pedestrian routes in Rozelle and Annandale. Interference and disruption of routes for four years is not a 'temporary' imposition.</p> |

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Therese McLean

Signature: 

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration : I HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 80/3-13 Eskmeville Rd

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- I am concerned that while the EIS finds that tolls do weigh more heavily on lower income motorists, there is no serious analysis of the blatant unfairness of letting of private consortium toll people for decades in order to pay for less profitable tollways for wealthier communities.
- I am concerned that SMC has selected one of Sydney's most dangerous traffic spots, Darley Rd in Leichhardt for a construction site that will bring hundreds of extra trucks and cars into the area on a daily basis for years.
- Permanent substation and water treatment plant - Residents on Darley Rd opposite the site and residents in Hubert St will have a direct line of site to the Motorway operation infrastructure. The resultant impact is a permanent degradation of the visual environment, is a loss of amenity and is detrimental to the community. This facility should not be permitted in this location and the EIS needs to demonstrate why it is required at this site. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site out of line of site of residents. The residual land should be returned for community purposes, such as green space, with future commercial uses ruled out. If the community is forced to endure 5 years of severe disruptions due to this toll road, the compensation should, at the very least, result in the land being returned to the community as green space.
- Darley Road is confirmed as a 'civil and tunnel site (dive site) with a 'Motorway Operations' site at one end for machinery during the build and will then house permanent water treatment facilities, despite evidence tendered to the Concept Design explaining that this intersection has an high accident rate and is completely unsuitable for such a purpose.
- The traffic around St Peters expected to be heavier because of the increased road access to the new Interchange will adversely affect our community because moving around to our parks and to the shops, to the buses and to the train stations, for pedestrians and cars, will be more difficult. Our community is being sacrificed for the marginal improvement in traffic movement elsewhere in Sydney. No measures to ameliorate the impact are mentioned. This is unacceptable.
- The EIS does not provide any opportunity to comment on the urban design and landscape component of the project. It states that 'a detailed review and finalisation of the architectural treatment of the project operational infrastructure would be undertaken 'during detailed design'. The Community should be given an opportunity to comment upon and influence the design and we object to the approval of the EIS on the basis that this detail is not provided, nor is the community (or other stakeholders) given an opportunity to comment or influence the final design.
- The latest EIS was released just ten business days after feedback period ended for the Concept Design for the M4/M5 and before preliminary drilling to establish a route through the Inner West is completed. WHAT IS THE RUSH? This EIS is little more than a concept design and is far less developed than earlier ones. It is composed of many indicate only plans such that it is impossible to know what the impacts will be and yet approval is being sought in a rush. The EIS ignores more than 1500 submissions, including one of 142 pages from the Inner West Council.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: Amy Cecilia Brandolini

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 234 Denison St

Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport
 Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
 WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- (1) Flooding – Leichhardt. Darley Road and adjacent streets such as Hubert St are exposed to flood. The flood impact could be exacerbated by the disruption or blockage of existing drainage networks, which are risks identified in the EIS. The EIS has not assessed whether the identified risk to the existing drainage network will cause increased risk of flood damage to flood lots and it fails to take account of the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan which contains recommended flood modification options. The EIS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM3 to lay additional pipes/culverts from Elswick Street to Hawthorne Canal (via Regent Street and Darley Road). RMS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM4 to lay additional pipes/ culverts from William Street to Hawthorne Canal via Hubert Street and Darley Road. The EIS should not be approved as it has not properly explained or assessed these impacts.
- (2) The substation and water treatment plant should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link. This will mean that the site is less visible to residents and most pedestrian access is at this end. There are no homes that will have direct line of site of the facility if it is moved. This will also enable direct pedestrian access to the light rail without the need to use the winding path at the rear of the site which creates safety issues and adds to the time required to access the light rail stop.
- (3) 1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.
- (4) I oppose the destruction of any more of Sydney's heritage for WestCONnex. I am appalled that Sydney Motorway Corporation is seeking approval to tunnel under hundreds of highly valued heritage buildings in Newtown without any serious assessment of risk at all. This heritage belongs to all of Sydney.
- (5) I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.
- (6) The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Amy Boardolini</u>
	Address: <u>234 Denison St Newtown</u>
Application Number: SS1 7485	Suburb: <u>Newtown</u> Postcode <u>2042</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:


- I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project, There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Peters and Haberfield or Rozelle, all traffic going to the CBD, East or into the Inner West will use local roads.
- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. *"..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval"*. It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a "review(ed) for consistency", and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie : the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)
- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
- Why is there no detailed information about the so called 'King Street Gateway' included in the EIS ?
- An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow 'swoosh' that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be 'encouraged' to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that 'definitive' rather than 'indicative' alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair 'definitive' document open for genuine public comment.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: CÉSAR MORENO

Signature: 

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 301/221 DARLINGHURST RD

Suburb: NSW Postcode: 2010

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- ❖ The Project will have significant impacts on the streets near on- and off-ramps. Modelling shows that the Anzac Bridge will have 60% more traffic in 2033 because of the Project.
 - ❖ The modelling does not consider the latest plans from the NSW Government's Greater Sydney Commission despite them being released nine months ago.
 - ❖ The management of water in the Rozelle Yards is of great concern as the site is highly contaminated and the construction work that will be carried out will cause a great deal of disturbance especially once vegetation has been removed. There will be potential impacts from contaminated soils, leakage/spills of hydrocarbons and other chemicals from machinery, vehicles transporting spoil adjacent to roads and stormwaters, rinse water from plant washing and concrete slurries. Water from tunnelling activity and other works will also introduce contaminants. The EIS says that much of this water will be treated in temporary treatment facilities and sediment tanks before being released to Whites Creek and Rozelle Bay. The EIS does not disclose what levels of pollution controls will be implemented to make sure that contaminated water is not released into White's Creek or Rozelle Bay. This is not acceptable.
 - ❖ Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This
- smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)
 - ❖ The EIS acknowledges that impacts of construction should M4M5 get approval will worsen traffic congestions on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it would be outrageous for motorists to be asked to pay up to up to \$20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.
 - ❖ There are two areas in the Rozelle Rail Yards site where construction will be by cut and cover. These are the Portals for the Western Harbour Tunnel and the Portals for the M4/M5 link. This is of particular concern in the light of residents experiences in areas of Haberfield and St Peters where highly contaminated land areas were being disturbed. There was totally inadequate control of dust in these areas, where the dust would have been loaded with toxic chemical particulates. The old Rail Yards are highly contaminated land from their past use. The EIS gives no specific details of how this highly toxic threat is going to be securely managed. It is not acceptable for this to be decided only when the Construction Contracts have been issued, when the community will have no say or control over the methodology to be employed for removing vast amounts of contaminated spoil.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name CA Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning
Services,Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001


Application Name:

WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

STORM ASHWOOD

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

81 Silver St

Suburb:

St Peters

Postcode

2044

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

- i. The EIS states that there may be a 'small increase in pollutant concentrations' near surface roads. The EIS states that potential health impacts associated with changes in air quality (specifically nitrogen dioxide and particulates) within the local community have been assessed and are considered to be 'acceptable.' We disagree that the impacts on human health are acceptable and object to the project in its entirety because of these impacts.
- ii. The EIS states that there are 'investigations' occurring into alternative access to the Darley Road site. The EIS does not provide any detail on which residents can comment about alternative access which would keep trucks off Darley Road. No spoil truck movements should be permitted on Darley Road and the plans for alternative access should be expedited. It should be a condition of approval that the alternative access is confirmed and that no spoil trucks are permitted to access Darley Road due to the unacceptable noise, safety and traffic issues that the current proposal creates
- iii. There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be date. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.
- iv. Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution— most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a massive number of extra truck movements and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times
- v. This EIS provides no basis on which to approve such a complex project including the building of interchanges underneath Sydney suburbs Rozelle and Leichhardt. It would be absurd to approve the building of up to three tunnels under people's homes on the basis of such flimsy information
- vi. The EIS lacks sufficient focus on traffic congestion in the suburbs of Alexandria and Erskineville. Are these being ignored because they will be even more congested than currently.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Troy Byrnes</i>	
	Address: <i>1/87 Albion St</i>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>surryhills</i>	Postcode <i>2010</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.

1. *The M4-M5 Link enables the expansion of the WestConnex network to include the Western Harbour Tunnel, Beaches Link and M6. These motorway projects, were not part of the WestConnex business case and are not priority projects in any State or Federal roads plan.*
2. *The business case is fatally flawed in a number of ways :*
 - *It does not factor in the impact of longer total journey lengths on urban sprawl, which will have a flow-cost for infrastructure and servicing.*
 - *It includes benefits from WestConnex supporting more compact commercial land use when this is generally not the result of motorway investment, and is unlikely to be in the area served by Stage 3.*
 - *It does not attempt to cost the reductions in public transport, especially the loss of fare revenue.*
 - *Ancillary road projects necessitated by WestConnex, such as the potentially \$1BN Alexandria-Moore Park Connectivity Upgrade, should have been included in the Business Case.*
 - *Impact on property values, costs of noise during construction, and loss of business*

should all have been costed and included in the Business Case

- *Loss of heritage to the whole community (not just property owners) should have been included in the Business Case.*
3. *The Government is spending many billions of taxpayer dollars via Metro Rail to try and free itself of the restrictions of the City Circle that imposes a choke on the whole rail network, but is now replicating a the city circle with a 60km road network. It does makes sense to focus a rail network on the centre of the densest employment and residential area of Australia, with the greatest economic output per square kilometre. However, it is the antithesis of common sense, practicality, economic productivity, property value creation, environmental planning, social planning and basic transport planning to replicate it with more motorways.*
 4. *The Business Case for the WestConnex project (made up of the New M4, Iron Cove Link and Rozelle Interchange, M4-M5 Link, New M5, King Georges Road Interchange upgrade and Sydney Gateway was not adequate to justify moving to environmental impact assessment.*

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Troy Byrnes

Signature: [Signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 187 Albion St

Suburb: Surry hills Postcode: 2010

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

1. The project fails to address its most fundamental objective of connecting to Port Botany, the genesis of the entire enterprise
2. Noise impacts - Pyrmont Bridge Road site - The EIS indicates that residents will be subjected to severe noise impacts for up to 4 months, caused by the long-term construction work proposed for this site which includes 8 weeks to demolish buildings, followed by 6 weeks to establish construction facilities, with pavement and infrastructure works required (EIS, 10-112) The EIS contains limited mitigation proposed to manage such impacts.
3. Volumes on the main links (the trunks) cannot be as high as what is claimed in the EIS. It is physically untenable.
4. I object to this stage of WestConnex which doesn't benefit western Sydney in any way because it doesn't even include the links to Port Botany or Sydney Airport which were the main justification for the whole project
5. Because the strategic model does not limit the volume on road links and at intersection to their ceiling capacity; it cannot (and was not designed to) be used precisely as it is. A mesoscopic model, which can provide more a far greater level of detail than the strategic model used would have ensured a more thorough analysis of the networks' ability to cope with the traffic predicted.
6. The EIS focusses on the impact of construction traffic during commuter peak-hours. Given the EIS notes that construction-related vehicles will be limited during peak-hours, information should be provided on the impact of construction-related vehicles when both traffic volumes are higher – in particular during weekday lunch peak and Saturday lunch peak for sites like the Pyrmont Bridge Road Tunnel Site where operations are proposed 24/7. (Tables 8-46, 8-47, 8-48, 8-51, 8-52, 8-53).
7. The EIS does not require an acoustic shed and states that 'Acoustic barriers and devices at the access tunnel entrances would be considered and implemented where reasonable and feasible to minimise potential noise impacts associated with out-of-hours works within the tunnels.'
8. SMC have made it extremely difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS. The local Glebe library only has one copy and this is the situation at other local libraries. There are very limited hours of access to these locations outside normal working hours. Access to the EIS is very difficult without access to a personal computer. This totally restricts open community engagement.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning
Services,Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001


Application Name:

WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Troy Byrnes

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

1/87 Albion St

Suburb:

Surry Hills

Postcode

2010

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

- 1) The Rozelle Rail Yards are a totally inappropriate area to create a new recreational area because the area will be highly polluted by unfiltered Pollution Stacks and Tunnel Portals. In the EIS it is referred to as an idealized area. "It is envisaged that the quantum of active recreation within the Rozelle Rail Yards would be further developed by others as projects such as The Bays Precinct are developed. The concept plan provides spaces that could include an array of active recreation opportunities and even community facilities such as gardens or a school." The suggestion that this would be a suitable location for a School is just beyond belief and demonstrates that those who have put these plans together are either staggeringly ignorant or totally delusional! At a time when major World cities are doing all they can to address the dire problems of pollution this is an appalling suggestion that is totally out of touch.
- 2) The EIS states that spoil handling at the Pyrmont Bridge Road Tunnel Site (C9) will "occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week" for about four years. Given the land use surrounding the site is dense residential, what mitigation measures will be used to control noise, light spill, etc. outside normal business hours? Have alternative living arrangements and/or compensation been considered? (P 8-55)
- 3) The assessment of Strategic Alternative 3 (Travel Demand Management) should:
 - ◆ Identify key network capacity issues
 - ◆ Consider the opportunity for travel demand management measures to address the road network capacity constraints. The measure should aim to retime, re-mode or reduce trips that make less productive use of congested road space.
 - ◆ Draw on a process of multi-modal transport modelling and economic assessment to inform the analysis and assessment
- 4) The EIS does not provide appropriate parking for the estimated 100 or so workers that the EIS states will work every day at the site, while other equivalent sites have allocated parking for such workers (Northcote Civil site (150)) and Parramatta Road East Civil site (140). It is also noted that the EIS provides for loss of 20 residential parks on Darley Road. Local streets are at capacity already because of the lack of off-street parking for many residents and the Light Rail stop which means that commuters use local streets. The EIS states that workers 'will be encouraged to use public transport.' the EIS needs to mandate that no trucks or construction vehicles are to park in local streets. There needs to be a requirement that is enforceable that workers use the Light Rail stop which is adjacent to the site or a plan to bus in workers

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Troy Byrne

Signature: Do my

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 1/87 Allion St

Suburb: Surry hills Postcode: 2010

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- 1) I am concerned that while the EIS finds that tolls do weigh more heavily on lower income motorists, there is no serious analysis of the blatant unfairness of letting of private consortium toll people for decades in order to pay for less profitable tollways for wealthier communities.
- 2) EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. "..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval". It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a "review(ed) for consistency", and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie : the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)
- 3) The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement may occur. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The EIS states

that 'settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment'. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres. This proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. In addition, the EIS states that there are a number of discrete areas to the north and northwest of the Rozelle Rail Yards, to the north of Campbell Road at St Peters and in the vicinity of Lord Street at Newtown where ground water movement above 20 milliliters is predicted 'strict limits on the degree of settlement permitted would be imposed on the project' and 'damage' would be rectified at no cost to the owner. would be placed (Executive Summary, xvii -iii). The project should not be permitted to be delivered in such a way that there is a known risk to property damage that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level of risk.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Troy Byrnes</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>1/87 Albion St</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Surry Hills</u> Postcode: <u>2010</u>	

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

1. Because this is still based on a "concept design" it is unknown how the communities affected will not know what is being done below their residences, schools, business premises and public spaces, particularly if the whole project is sold into a private corporation's ownership before the actual designs and construction plans are determined. The EIS makes references to these designs and plans being reviewed but there is **NO** information as to what agency will be responsible for such reviews or whether the outcomes of such reviews will be made public. The communities below whose homes, business premises, public buildings and public spaces this massive project will be excavated and built will be completely in the dark about what is being done, what standards it is supposed to comply with, what inspection or scrutiny it will subject to, and whether the private corporations undertaking the work will be held to any liability by our government.
2. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically mention all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
3. Streets in Haberfield would be subject to heavy vehicle traffic for a further four years, making at least 7 years of heavy impacts on a single suburb. The answer is not a "community strategy". Residents who believed that their pain would be over after the M4 east are now being asked to sustain a further four years of impacts. No compensation or serious mitigation is suggested.
4. The EIS states that investigation would be undertaken to confirm whether the Victoria Road bridge is a potential roost site for microbats. There will be attempts to 'manage potential impacts' if confirmed. This is inadequate. The project should not be permitted to impact on vulnerable species.
5. I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: CAROLYN D. PAOLASignature: [Signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 74 Edgbaston RdSuburb: Beverly Hills Postcode 2209**I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:**

- ◆ Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.
- ◆ The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' Therefore this entire process is a sham as the extent to which concerns are taken into account is not known as the contractor can simply make further changes. As the contractor is not bound to take into account community impacts outside of the strict requirements and as the contractor will be trying to deliver the project as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is likely that the additional measure proposed with respect to construction noise mitigation for (example) will not be adopted. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS is riddled with caveats and lacks clear obligations and requirements for project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail.
- ◆ It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.
- ◆ There has been no 'meaningful' consultation with the community. Some areas affected by M3/M5 have not even been letterboxed by SMC. These include St Peters and sections of Erskineville. The SMC received hundreds of submissions on its concept design and failed to respond to any of these before lodging this EIS.
- ◆ The substation and water treatment plant should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link. This will mean that the site is less visible to residents and most pedestrian access is at this end. There are no homes that will have direct line of site of the facility if it is moved. This will also enable direct pedestrian access to the light rail without the need to use the winding path at the rear of the site which creates safety issues and adds to the time required to access the light rail stop.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485


Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Bella White

Signature:



Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.

I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

9 Bangalow ave

Suburb:

Beecroft

Postcode 2119

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- ◇ I am concerned that while hundreds of impacts on resident, including noise, loss of business, dust, and lost time through more traffic congestion, are identified in the EIS, the approach is always to recommend approval and promise vague 'mitigation' in the future. This is not good enough.
- ◇ The EIS at 7-21 states that Community update Newsletters were distributed to residents 'near the project footprint' in many suburbs. This statement is simply not correct. No such newsletters were received by residents in central and northern Newtown. SMC was made aware of this fact, but has not responded to verbal and written requests for audited confirmation of the addresses 'letterboxed'. This statement of community engagement should be rejected by the Department.
- ◇ The EIS states that traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange is expected to be worse after completion of the M5 and the M4-M5 Link particularly in the evening peak hour. The EIS admits that this will have a "moderate negative" impact on the neighbourhood in increasing pollution (also admitted separately) therefore in health impacts, on safety for foot and cycle traffic but also for vehicles and on the local amenity.
- ◇ The EIS acknowledges that visual impacts will occur during construction. However it does not propose to address these negative impacts in the design of the project. This is unacceptable and the EIS needs to propose walls,, plant and perimeter treatments and other measures at appropriate locations to lessen the impact on visual amenity. (Executive Summary xviii)
- ◇ It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?
- ◇ This EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain – and is certainly not included here.
- ◇ Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex and the government is seeking approval, yet there are no detailed construction plans so we are not speaking to a real situation.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Application Number: SSI 7485 Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Name: <u>Bill Holliday</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: <u>113 CHARLES ST</u> Suburb: <u>LILYFIELD</u> Postcode: <u>2040</u>
---	--

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

1. Along with the widening of the Crescent at Annandale the White's Creek bridge is to be rebuilt. This will mean that the road in this area will be reduced in width as first one side of the bridge is rebuilt followed by the other. Added to the additional volume of trucks from the Rozelle Rail Yards, the Crescent Civil site and the Camperdown site this is going to lead to massive congestion on Johnston St and all along the Crescent towards Ross St and make it virtually impossible for residents to exit and return to their local area. It is most likely that the commercial sectors of the Tramsheds development will be badly affected.
2. The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.
3. The Inner West Greenway was considered but not assessed as a cumulative impact. One of the claimed project benefits of the proposal is improved east/west crossings of Parramatta Rd for pedestrians/bikes and the Greenway would achieve this and should be assessed and provided as part of the project. The Greenway was part of inner west LR project before it was deferred in 2011 and Inner West Council has done extensive work on it.
4. Human health risk (Executive Summary xvi) – The EIS states that there may be a 'small increase in pollutant concentrations' near surface roads. The EIS states that potential health impacts associated with changes in air quality (specifically nitrogen dioxide and particulates) within the local community have been assessed and are considered to be 'acceptable.' We disagree that the impacts on human health are acceptable and object to the project in its entirety because of these impacts.
5. At the western end of Bignell Lane near Pyrmont Bridge Road existing flood depth was identified up to one metre in the 100 year ARI. The NSW Government Floodplain Development Manual (2005) identifies this location as a high flood hazard area.
6. The EIS states the Inner West Interchange would be under 3 suburbs – Lilyfield, Annandale and Leichhardt – so clearly it would cover a very extensive area (see map in EIS Vol 1A Chap 5 Part 1 p11) with drilling and danger of subsidence affecting hundreds of homes.
7. The modelling has thousands of unreleased cars at key locations; i.e. in reality those unreleased vehicles would result in vehicle queues and or network failure.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention: Director, Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services Department of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:	BILL HOLLIDAY
Address:	113 CHARLES ST LILYPOND Suburb
Post Code	2040
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes / No	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	
Signed:	Date 24/9/17

I **object** to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application #SSI 7485 for the reason(s) set out below.

• **Asbestos contaminated site**

I **object** to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

The proponent in identifying the potential contamination impacts at Darley Road states that:

'Previous soil investigations identified fill material with slightly elevated metals and PAHs, although the site is still suitable for ongoing commercial/industrial land use. A UST has also been decommissioned. If present and not appropriately controlled, there is potential for:

- Direct contact, inhalation and ingestion risk to site workers from contaminated soil or hazardous building materials via dust
- Discharge of contaminated surface water to the stormwater system and ultimately Hawthorne Canal and Iron Cove
- Incorrect handling or disposal of spoil
- Disturbance of actual or potential acid sulphate soils at the western end of the site which could impact local soil and water quality.

The proponent's assessment is defective as it fails to identify the risk to local residents and anyone else in the neighbourhood of excavated soil containing contaminants and asbestos being blown into nearby streets and into homes and gardens of adjoining properties. The proponent's assessment is defective because having identified the presence of asbestos on the site it fails to specifically identify the potential for inhalation of asbestos either by workers or residents.

I **object** to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of asbestos and other contaminants will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>BILL HOLLIDAY</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>113 CHARLES ST</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>LILYFIELD</u> Postcode: <u>2040</u>	

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application.**

- I. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement may occur. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The EIS states that 'settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment'. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres. This proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. In addition, the EIS states that there are a number of discrete areas to the north and northwest of the Rozelle Rail Yards, to the north of Campbell Road at St Peters and in the vicinity of Lord Street at Newtown where ground water movement above 20 milliliters is predicted 'strict limits on the degree of settlement permitted would be imposed on the project' and 'damage' would be rectified at no cost to the owner. would be placed (Executive Summary, xvii -iii). The project should not be permitted to be delivered in such a way that there is a known risk to property damage that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level of risk.
- II. The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. In relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.
- III. Where is the commitment to community consultation and to long term planning when the EIS for the M4/M5 Link is released before any response to the extensive community feedback on the M4-M5 Link concept design could possibly have been seriously considered. This demonstrates deep government contempt for the people of NSW and the communities of the Inner West of Sydney in particular.
- IV. Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. There must be a review of the NSW government's unacceptable policy on this issue. I am appalled that the ex Minister for Planning Rob Stokes who approved the New M5 and unfiltered stacks in St Peters and Haberfield would declare that he would not have them in his own area. How can residents have any trust in a process that is underpinned by such hypocrisy.
- V. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters Interchange will have a heavy disruptive impact on the local transport routes, whether by vehicle, bus, or active transport (walking and cycling).

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: KRISTINE SHORT
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: 11A BOUVARDIA ST Suburb: ASQUITH Postcode 2077
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>Kristine Short</i>
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The Concept Design was a woefully inadequate document totally devoid of any real depth of detail in terms of maps, scales, distances with only vague suggestions and glamorized Artist's Impressions of an idealized view of what Stage 3 would be like. It was another example of current city planning documents that consistently accentuate huge areas of tranquil green spaces with families and children out walking and riding bicycles in idealized parks and suburbs. All this is total PR spin and bears no reality about the real outcome of the build. It bears no reality as to what Stage 3 of Westconnex will be like.*
- There has been no 'meaningful' consultation with the community. Some areas affected by M3/M5 have not even been letterboxed by SMC. These include St Peters and sections of Erskineville. The SMC received hundreds of submissions on its concept design and failed to respond to any of these before lodging this EIS.*
- The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres underground. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 27metres. Piper St 37metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2)*
- Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.*
- It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area, Rozelle*
- The EIS admits that the increased traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange will impact on bus running times especially in the evening peak hour and increase the time taken (2.5 minutes, which seems optimistic). The 422 bus and associated cross city services which use the Princes Highway are notorious for irregular running times because of the congestion on the Princes highway and cross roads, so an admitted worsening of the running time will adversely impact the people who are dependent on the buses. This will be compounded by the loss of train services at St Peters station while it is closed for the Sydney Metro build and then subsequently when it re-opens. In all the impact of the new M5 and the M4-M5 link is to worsen access to public transport significantly for the residents of the St Peters neighbourhood.*

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

KRIS GOMAN

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:

73 WILSON ST

Suburb:

NEWTOWN

Postcode


2042

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- o The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.
- o The EIS at 12-57 describes possible disruptions of water supply to a vast area of Sydney as a result of tunnelling in the proximity of two major Sydney Water Tunnels in the Newtown area, stating "Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water Assets". Why has an EIS been published that infers that the tunnel alignments have been thoroughly surveyed and researched, when further survey work could dramatically alter the alignments in the future ?
- o The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.
- o The assessment and solution to potentially serious problems described in the EIS at 12-57 (where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs) is "based on assumptions about the strength and stiffness of the water tunnels given that limited information about the design and condition of these assets was available. Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water assets. A detailed assessment would be carried out in consultation with Sydney Water to demonstrate that construction of the M4-M5 Link tunnels would have negligible adverse settlement or vibration impacts on these tunnels. A settlement monitoring program would also be implemented during construction to validate or reassess the predictions should it be required." The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- o It all very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Mileko DRUMMOND</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>32 York St.</u>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <u>Sydney.</u>	Postcode <u>2000</u>
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		
Signature: 		

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project, There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Peters and Haberfield or Rozelle, all traffic going to the CBD, East or into the Inner West will use local roads.
- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. *"..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval"*. It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a "review(ed) for consistency", and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie : the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)
- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
- Why is there no detailed information about the so called 'King Street Gateway' included in the EIS ?
- An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow 'swoosh' that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be 'encouraged' to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that 'definitive' rather than 'indicative' alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair 'definitive' document open for genuine public comment.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Suzanne H. Crane

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 34B Bulls Road

Suburb: Cronulla NSW Postcode: 2230

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments


Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- ✦ The EIS states that there are 'investigations' occurring into alternative access to the Darley Road site. The EIS does not provide any detail on which residents can comment about alternative access which would keep trucks off Darley Road. No spoil truck movements should be permitted on Darley Road and the plans for alternative access should be expedited. It should be a condition of approval that the alternative access is confirmed and that no spoil trucks are permitted to access Darley Road due to the unacceptable noise, safety and traffic issues that the current proposal creates
- ✦ I strongly object to the proposed location of this permanent operational facility on Darley Road. The presence of this site contradicts repeated assurances to the community that the site would be returned after construction was completed. The ongoing presence of this site will limit future uses of the darley Road site which could serve community purposes, particularly given its location directly next to public transport. Its presence removes the ability to provide more accessible, safer and direct pedestrian access to the North Leichhardt Light Rail Station. The plant location, in a neighbourhood setting is not appropriate. It will reduce property values and have an unacceptable impacts on the visual amenity of the area. The streets adjacent to Darley Road are comprised of low-rise residential homes and small businesses and infrastructure such as this should not be permitted in such a location.
- ✦ The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.
- ✦ The EIS acknowledges that 'rat running' by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.
- ✦ Traffic operational modelling - Leichhardt. The EIS does not provide any operational modelling for the Darley Road area (8-11), despite the fact 170 vehicles a day are proposed to enter this highly congested (during peak hours) area. Darley Road is a critical arterial road for commuters accessing the City West Link and this analysis should be provided so that impacts can be properly assessed.
- ✦ Removal of vegetation - Leichhardt. The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the Darley Road site. There are several mature trees located on the north of the site. None of these trees should be removed as they provide precious greenery. They also act as a visual and noise screen for residents from the City West Link traffic. All efforts should be taken to retain the trees and the EIS should not simply permit these trees to be removed without proper investigations being undertaken as to how they can be retained. If they are removed following a proper investigation and consideration of all options, then the approval needs to specify that all streets are replaced with mature, native trees at the conclusion of the construction at the site.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: EVAN THORNTON Signature: 
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: 31 Holman Rd Cyrene Suburb: Cyrene Postcode 2227.

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application

- ⇒ I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.
- ⇒ This EIS contains **no meaningful** design and construction details and no parameters as to how broad changes and therefore impacts could be. It therefore fails to allow the community to be informed about and comment on the project impacts in a meaningful way.
- ⇒ The EIS at 7-25 refers to 876 comments (limited to 140 characters) made via the collaborative map on the Concept Design 'up to July' that were considered in the preparation of the EIS. It does not mention the many hundreds of extended written submissions that were lodged in late July and early August. These critical 'community engagement' feedback submissions have clearly not been considered in the preparation of the EIS. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
- ⇒ The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable
- ⇒ Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat - the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.
- ⇒ I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.
- ⇒ Many students walk or ride to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College schools via Darley Road. There are also a number of childcare centres very close to the Darley Road site.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Jade Fitzpatrick</u>
	Address: <u>45 Lillyvicks Crescent</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Ambarvale</u> Postcode <u>2560</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The EIS social and economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestConnex has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.
- The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.
- The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.
- I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtering stacks extra stacks could be added later.
- The EIS acknowledges that impacts of construction should M4M5 get approval will worsen traffic congestions on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it would be outrageous for motorists to be asked to pay up to up to \$20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.
- Streets in Haberfield would be subject to heavy vehicle traffic for a further four years, making at least 7 years of heavy impacts on a single suburb. The answer is not a "community strategy". Residents who believed that their pain would be over after the M4 east are now being asked to sustain a further four years of impacts. No compensation or serious mitigation is suggested.
- The EIS acknowledges that four years of M4/M5 construction would have a negative economic and social impact across the Inner West through interrupted traffic routes, slower traffic times, disruption with public transport, interruption with businesses and loss of connections across communities. This finding highlights the need for a proper cost benefit analysis for the project. Such social costs should not simply be dismissed with the promise of a construction plan into which the community has not input or powers to enforce.
- I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____


Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: EMILY SPEERS MEARD

Signature: 

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 52 EDENWARE RD

Suburb: ENMORE

Postcode 2042

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- ◆ Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.
- ◆ The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' Therefore this entire process is a sham as the extent to which concerns are taken into account is not known as the contractor can simply make further changes. As the contractor is not bound to take into account community impacts outside of the strict requirements and as the contractor will be trying to deliver the project as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is likely that the additional measure proposed with respect to construction noise mitigation for (example) will not be adopted. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS is riddled with caveats and lacks clear obligations and requirements for project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail.
- ◆ It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.
- ◆ There has been no 'meaningful' consultation with the community. Some areas affected by M3/M5 have not even been letterboxed by SMC. These include St Peters and sections of Erskineville. The SMC received hundreds of submissions on its concept design and failed to respond to any of these before lodging this EIS.
- ◆ The substation and water treatment plant should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link. This will mean that the site is less visible to residents and most pedestrian access is at this end. There are no homes that will have direct line of sight of the facility if it is moved. This will also enable direct pedestrian access to the light rail without the need to use the winding path at the rear of the site which creates safety issues and adds to the time required to access the light rail stop.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: ALAN FIKS

Signature: [Signature]

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 4/16 CARLISLE ST

Suburb: BONDI Postcode: 2026

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5
Link

- ❖ Night works – Leichhardt. The EIS states that to minimize disruptions to traffic on the existing road network (including in peak hours) there will be night works where appropriate. Given the congested nature of Darley Road, it is likely there will be frequent night work (EIS, 6.4). This will create an unacceptable impact in residents. It is unacceptable that a highly unsuitable site has been selected. And, instead of a proper plan to manage traffic, the EIS contemplate work simply occurring at night. This is objected to in the strongest terms.
- ❖ The removal of Buruwan Park between The Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Parade, Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a direct loss of much-needed parkland in this inner city area. Further, Buruwan Park lies on a major cycle route from Railway Parade through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD.
- ❖ There will be 100 workers a day on the site, with provision for only 10-20 car spaces and there is a concession that local streets will be used, who will be 'encouraged' to use public transport. Our experience with the major construction sites in Haberfield, and St Peters that public transport is not used by the workers and that despite the fact they are not supposed to do so, they park in our local streets and cause strife with our residents.
- ❖ The EIS admits that air pollutants will exceed permitted levels along the Canal Rd used to access the St Peters Interchange because the traffic will be heavier. This is an unacceptable impact which will adversely affect vehicle users because it is known that people in their vehicles are not protected from the air pollution, as well as anyone on foot or cycling in the streets around the interchange. No amelioration is offered.
- ❖ The EIS states that investigation would be undertaken to confirm whether the Victoria Road bridge is a potential roost site for microbats. There will be attempts to 'manage potential impacts' if confirmed. This is inadequate. The project should not be permitted to impact on vulnerable species.
- ❖ I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.
- ❖ I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____