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 statements.

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

I. 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.

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. 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.

IV. 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.

V. 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.

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

I. It is stated that if congestion proves to be a problem then other solutions will have to be found. Other routes that are being considered will be using the Western Distributor, the Crescent, Victoria Rd, Ross St, Pyrmont Bridge Rd and Johnston St. The Crescent and Johnston St are clearly going to be used. This despite the fact that in a consultation those representing Westconnex assured residents of Annandale that neither Johnston St or Booth St would be used. It is expected that these routes will also be used for night transport. It is clear that it is unlikely that transportation routes shown in the EIS will be adhered to. This is unacceptable.

II. 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?

III. 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.

IV. 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.

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.
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 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 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 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.

- 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 filtrating 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: VB
Address: 25/1 Goodwill St
Suburb: St Peters
Postcode: 2136

Application Number: SSI 7485
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
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.

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. 11599 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.

ii. 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.

iii. 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.

iv. 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.

v. 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
Submission to: Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attention: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: PAULINE LOCIEE
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 commodore ST
Suburb: NEWTOWN
Postcode 2041

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. Land Subsidence in the areas of all tunnel routes is of great concern to all residents. This is of especial concern in the Rozelle / Lilyfield area where there are layers of tunnels. There is likely to be ongoing and considerable subsidence even when the tunnels are built due to the ongoing necessity to remove ground water from the tunnels. This will lead to a slow drying out of the sandstone and hence settlement.

b. 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!

c. Acquisition of Dan Morphys – I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Morphys 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.

d. 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.

e. Why is there no detailed information about the so called ‘King Street Gateway’ included 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 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. 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. 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.

B. 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.

C. 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.

D. 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.

E. 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.

F. 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.

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 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 60 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 WestCONnexit.
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) 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.

b) In 2033 with the M4-M5 link the WRTM is forecasting reductions in peak travel times between the M4 corridor and the Sydney Airport/Port Botany area. The times savings that are quoted miniscule! Between Parramatta and Sydney Airport the time saving is 10 minutes. Between Burwood and Sydney Airport the time saving is 5 minutes. Between Silverwater and Port Botany the time saving is 10 minutes. So for well over $20 Billion all that can be saved is just a handful of minutes! This total waste of public money is completely unacceptable.

c) I object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site because of the unacceptable risk it will create to the safety of our community. Darley Road is a known accident and traffic blackspot and the movements of hundreds of trucks a day will create an unacceptable risk of accidents. On Transport for NSW’s own figures, the intersection at the City West Link and James Street is the third most dangerous in the inner west.

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

Name: PAULINE LOCKIE

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 COMMANDO 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

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.

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 ____________________
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. The 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 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, 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 Murphy’s 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. 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.

Yours sincerely, Pauline Lockie 4 Commodore St, Newtown NSW 2042, Australia

This email was sent by Pauline Lockie 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 Pauline provided an email address (info@paulinelockie.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Pauline Lockie at info@paulinelockie.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: Sam Crushtwhite

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: 2/2 Lentworth St, Point Piper

Suburb: Point Piper Postcode 2027

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/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?

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 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. 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.

II. 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.

III. 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.

IV. 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.

V. 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.

VI. 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.

VII. 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.
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 specifically object to the removal of the lighting tower and the Port Authority Building. These items are of considerable local significance and are representative of the operation of the Rozelle Rail Yards in the first part of the 20th century. I do not agree with trashing industrial history when it could be put to good community use.

- Noise impacts – Camperdown. The EIS indicates that a large number of residents will be affected by construction noise caused by demolition and pavement and infrastructure works. This includes use of a rock breaker and concrete saw. During all periods of construction, there will be noise impacts from construction of site car parking and deliveries and pavement and infrastructure works. No proper mitigation measures are proposed to protect residents from these impacts (10-118, EIS) The EIS admits that three residents and two businesses will be subject to noise impacts above acceptable levels for 16 days (10-119, EIS) No detail is provided as to whether alternative accommodation will be offered or other compensation.

- Easton Park has a long history and is part of an urban environment which is unusual in Sydney. The park needs to be assessed from a visual design point of view. It will be quite a different park when its view is changed to one of a large ventilation stack. The suggestion that it has been 'saved' needs to be considered in the light of the severe 5 years construction impacts and the reshaped urban environment.

- Cumulative construction impacts – Camperdown. The EIS states that residents will likely be subject to cumulative construction impacts as several tunnelling works activities may operate simultaneously (10-119, EIS) No mitigation steps are proposed to ease this impact on those affected.

- 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.

- Ground-borne out-of-hours work – Camperdown. The EIS acknowledges the noise and vibration impacts and the need for work to occur outside of standard daytime construction hours. It simply states that 'the specific management strategy for addressing potential impacts associated with ground-borne noise...would be documented in the OOHW protocol. This is inadequate as the community have no opportunity to comment on the OOHW protocol or the management of the ongoing impacts to which they will be subjected.

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 for the following reasons:

1. 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)

2. 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?

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. The widening of the Crescent between the City West link and Johnston St with an extra lane being constructed will lead to heavy traffic congestion. This will be exacerbated still further by extra traffic light control cycles being incorporated into the signaling at both Johnston St and at the City West Link, with the inclusion of an extra traffic light control 400m West from the Crescent / City West Link junction to manage the movement of large numbers of spoil trucks.

8. 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.”
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 spacers 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: [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: 23 [Street] CAMPERDOWN Postcode: 2050

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

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

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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?

6. 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.

7. 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 ___________________________
Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attention: Director — Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485
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.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

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: 

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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 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 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 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.

➢ 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?
Attention Director
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Name: Amy Banks

Address:

Application Number: SSI 7485
Suburb: Balmain
Postcode

Application Name: WestConnex M4-5S 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 M4-5S 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 statements.

- 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 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 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.

- 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 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.
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: Raphaële Freedman-Smith

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: 9/29 Pmc st

Suburb: Chippendale

Postcode: 2008

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.

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.

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.

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 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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?

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

Name: [Redacted]
Signature: [Redacted]

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: 9/29 Pine Street
Suburb: Marrickville
Postcode: 2204

- 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.

- 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.

- 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

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

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: ... Freedman-Smith

Signature: ... Freedman

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, CLT....

Suburb: Marrickville

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 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.

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.

Rozelle is an old and historic suburb 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.

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.

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: Raphaëlle Freeman-Smith

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: 9/12a Pine St

Suburb: Marrickville

Postcode: 2204

Submission to: Planning Service; 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

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.

Raphaela U. Freedom-Smith

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: 9/2a Pine St, Marrickville

Suburb: Marrickville

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.

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.

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 in 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.

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: Raphaella Freeman-Smith

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: 9/29 Pine St

Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2204

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 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.

No noise barriers have been proposed. This is unacceptable and appropriate noise barriers should be included in the EIS for consideration. (Executive Summary xvii)

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.

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.

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.

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: Raphaella Freedman-Smith
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: 9/29 Pine St
Suburb: Marrickville, Postcode: 2204

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

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

◊ The construction and operation of the project will result in 51 property acquisitions. We object to the project in its entirety because of this impact. We note that a number of long-standing businesses have been acquired and that many families and businesses in earlier stages have been forced to go to court to seek fair compensation. We object to the acquisition in particular of the Dan Murphys site. The business was substantially renovated and a new business opened with full knowledge of the likely acquisition. We object to it being acquired and compensated in circumstances which led to this occurring (Executive Summary xvii)

◊ 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.

◊ 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 EIS refers to the construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

◊ 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.

◊ 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.
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: ..............................................................
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: ..............................................................
Suburb: ..............................................................
Postcode: ............................................................

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 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, costsings, and business case.

- 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 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.

- 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.

- 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."

- 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.

- One of the main reasons for establishing Burwood 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 were 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: [Signature]

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: 64, Gowrie St, Marrickville, NSW 2204

Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2204

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

Name: Emma

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: 45 George St

Suburb: New Town

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

a) 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)

b) 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.

c) 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?

d) 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.

e) The EIS states that an alternative truck movement is proposed which involves use of the City West Link and no need for spoil trucks to access Darley Road. This proposal is supported, subject to further information about potential impacts being provided. The EIS should not be approved on its current basis which provides for 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road on a daily basis. This will create unacceptable safety issues and noise impacts for adjacent homes while also compromising pedestrian and bicycle access to the light rail and bay run. It will also lead to truck chaos on this critical arterial road providing access to and across the City west Link. The current proposal which provides for truck movements solely on Darley Road should not be approved and approval should only be given to the alternative proposal I repeat however my objection to the selection of this site altogether, but propose the least worst impact should be chosen if this site is to be used.

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

Name: Emma R. Coome

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 Crown St

Suburb: Newtown 2042

Postcode: 2042

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 social and economic impact study fails to record the great concern for valued Newtown heritage.

b) I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.

c) 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.

d) 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.

e) 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.

f) 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.

g) 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.

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: David Ford

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: 3/2C Gladstone St, 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

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

a. 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.

b. 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.

c. The construction and operation of the project will result in 51 property acquisitions. We object to the project in its entirety because of this impact. We note that a number of long-standing businesses have been acquired and that many families and businesses in earlier stages have been forced to go to court to seek fair compensation. We object to the acquisition in particular of the Dan Murphys site. The business was substantially renovated and a new business opened with full knowledge of the likely acquisition. We object to it being acquired and compensated in this circumstances and call on the Government to investigate the circumstances which led to this occurring (Executive Summary xvii)

d. 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.

e. 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.

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

Name: HELEN
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: 43, HOROBIN ST
Suburb: NEWTOWN
Postcode: 2042

- 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.

- The construction and operation of the project will result in 51 property acquisitions. We object to the project in its entirety because of this impact. We note that a number of long-standing businesses have been acquired and that many families and businesses in earlier stages have been forced to go to court to seek fair compensation. We object to the acquisition in particular of the Dan Murphys site. The business was substantially renovated and a new business opened with full knowledge of the likely acquisition. We object to it being acquired and compensated in this circumstances and call on the Government to investigate the circumstances which led to this occurring (Executive Summary xvii)

- 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?

- 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.

- 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.

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: [Signature]

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, HORSE N SR

Suburb: NEWTOWN

Postcode 2041

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.

Campaign Mailing Lists

Name __________________________ Email __________________________ Mobile __________________________

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 '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 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 statements.

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.

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.

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.

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.
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 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 identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. It states that risks are identified 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.

- 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.

- 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.

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

Name: [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: 43 HORDEN ST

Postcode 2041

Suburb: NEWTOWN

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

I. 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.

II. 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 29meters. 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.

III. I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.

IV. 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.
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.

- 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 no 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 ___________________
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.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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. 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.

4. 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 ___________________________
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 statements.

- 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: Sue Boyer
Signature: Doe

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: 2/150 Wygram Rd, Forest Lodge
Suburb: Forest Lodge
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
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 ___________________________
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 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 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. 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 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.

✓ 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)

✓ I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.
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 M4/M5 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. It 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
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- 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.

- 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 filtrating 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
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

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

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 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.

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.

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.

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 __________________________

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: 174 DARLEY STREET

Suburb: NEWTON Postcode 2042

Signature __________________________
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: [signature]

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: 174 ONLEY STREET, NEWTOWN, 2042

Suburb: NEWTOWN

Postcode: 2042

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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 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: PRATT, MARTIN

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: 174 DARLEY STREET

Suburb: NELSON

Postcode: 2047

The Project focuses on 'catering for traffic growth' (P4.15). This contradicts and undermines the NSW Government's Long Term Transport Master Plan and Future Transport website which commit to an integrated approach to congestion management focused on land use planning, demand management, public transport investment and "a coherent whole of network planning strategy", essentially aiming for growth in public transport and containing road demand to that required to serve the freight and servicing tasks.

The NSW Government appears to have accepted the project as part of a State Infrastructure Strategy and other plans before a business case was even developed. There was no incentive to explore alternatives or to fully explore the costs and benefits. This process has been described as "lock in". Commitment escalates because a project appears in numerous policy documents. WestConnex is a clear example of government "locking in" commitment before detailed analysis had been undertaken. With the Government fully locked-in to WestConnex, these issues and inadequacies with the Updated Business Case are repeated in the EIS.

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.

Crucially, to make the sale more attractive, the tunnels between Haberfield and St Peters will be built independently of the Rozelle Interchange. This is being done to de-risk the project for the private sector sale, as the tunnels can be built using known standards and technology and generate income from January 2023. It would appear that the building of the Rozelle Interchange is so risky that no contractor tendered for the contract in the original tender period.

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.

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 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 strongly object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link for a multitude of reasons, including:

- It is a toll road project made for big business, searching for a rationale.
- It fails to meet the primary objectives of providing a direct motorway connection between Western Sydney and Sydney Airport and Port.
- The Environmental Impact Statement does not safeguard communities. Government is seeking planning approval to sell the project to the private sector and discharging its responsibility and control for the delivery of the project.
- There is a lack of strategic justification for the project. No feasible alternatives have been developed or assessed.
- There will be major impacts on the Anzac Bridge (projected 60% increase in daily traffic) and Sydney City Centre. The EIS forecasts major impacts on bus travel time and reliability.
- The EIS does not adequately account for impacts on health and air quality. The EIS identifies an additional 5 unfiltered ventilation stacks to be constructed in inner Sydney. In addition local surface roads will be widened and traffic volumes will increase.
- Lack of alignment with the NSW Government's priorities and policies
- Major impacts on the community
- Legacy impacts and worsening intergenerational equity
- Other global cities are investing in fast and efficient public transport that truly connects homes and jobs, supports the decentralisation of commercial investment and develops a resilient and equitable city for future generations.

At the Rozelle Rail Yards site there will be 2 entry/exits for Heavy vehicles off the City West Link. Extra traffic controls are to be set up with extra sequences of traffic light controls to enable spoil trucks to access and exit this site. It is stated there will be 517 Heavy Truck movements as day of which 46 will be in Peak hours, plus 10 truck movements from the Crescent site. Maps showing the truck movements show that all these trucks will use the City West link. Similar maps for Darley Rd dive site also show trucks from there using the City West Link. At a consultation with a Westconnex staff member it was stated that trucks removing spoil from Camperdown dive site would be stationed and called up from James Craig Rd, so there will also be a constant movement of trucks from this location onto the City West Link. The EIS states the cumulative effect of truck movements from all sites onto the City West Link will be 700 one way Heavy truck movements a day and of that 208 will be in Peak hours. This will cause total gridlock. The EIS says other routes maybe considered; there are no details of these. This is unacceptable as it would allow a privately owned SMC to make whatever decisions they saw fit when and if the EIS is approved with no input from the community allowed.

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
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: [Redacted]
Signature: [Redacted]

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: 174 Darley Street
Suburb: Newtown
Postcode: 2042

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.

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.

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.

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 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 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 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.

- 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.

- 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."

- 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.

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

Name: Dianne Caflagher

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: 11 Altermark Street

Suburb: Newtown

Postcode: 2042

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Application Number: SSI 7485

1. 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.

2. 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 Ms. 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.

3. 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.

4. The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4–Ms 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. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

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: Tricia Carlton

Signature: Tricia Carlton

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: 309-32 Alice St

Suburb: Newtown

Postcode: 2042

a) 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 "reviewed for consistency", and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved until 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).

b) 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.

c) 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?

d) 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.

e) The EIS states that an alternative truck movement is proposed which involves use of the City West Link and no need for spoil trucks to access Darley Road. This proposal is supported, subject to further information about potential impacts being provided. The EIS should not be approved on its current basis which provides for 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road on a daily basis. This will create unacceptable safety issues and noise impacts for adjacent homes while also compromising pedestrian and bicycle access to the light rail and bay run. It will also lead to truck chaos on this critical arterial road providing access to and across the City West Link. The current proposal which provides for truck movements solely on Darley Road should not be approved and approval should only be given to the alternative proposal. I repeat however my objection to the selection of this site altogether, but propose the least worst impact should be chosen if this site is to be used.

f) 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.

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
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.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 74135, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Linda Murphy

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 Tredale St, Newtown, 2042

Submission to: Planning Service, Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 74135

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Acoustic shed - Pyrmont Bridge Road site -
Despite setting out the noise impacts of construction at this site, the lowest grade acoustic shed is proposed as mitigation. The EIS states that the Acoustic shed performance should be 'upgraded' and the site hoarding increased to 4 metres 'in select areas.' (EIS, 10-119). No detail is provided as to how effectively these enhancements will manage the noise and vibration impacts of construction.

The Inner City Regional Bike Network has not been included among projects assessed under Cumulative Impacts. It is identified by Infrastructure Australia as a Priority Initiative and should be included.

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

Visual amenity - Pyrmont Bridge Road site -
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)

Of the six areas of disturbance and 11 Historical Archaeological Management Units (HAMUs) identified in Chapter 20 of the EIS, none are within the Sydney LGA.

Increased traffic cannot be accommodated in Central Sydney. It will further impede pedestrian movement and comfort and undermine easy access to public transport and reduce access to jobs over large areas of the city. It will undermine the attractiveness of Central Sydney to internationally competitive high productivity firms and their potential employees. Overall productivity is adversely affected.

Map 2 in Vol 1A Chap 5 Pt 1 shows four intersecting tunnels, each 3 lanes wide, with four toll locations, apparently converging under Mayes, Young, Ferris, Moore, Catherine, Hill, John, Emma, Styles, Ilka, Paling, and the many other surrounding streets. The construction of four intersecting tunnels at varying depths in a spaghetti junction network would exacerbate ground settlement and vibrations, and cause homes most of which are Federation or earlier above the Interchange to be seriously impacted.
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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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?

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

Name: Linda Murphy
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: Fredare St, New Farm, Postcode: 4005

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.

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 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?

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

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 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.

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.

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 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. There will be 5 entrances/exits to the Rozelle Yards site off Lilyfield Road for light vehicles and 2 entrances/exits for Heavy vehicles off the City West Link. The 2 entrances on the City West Link, one opposite the exit of the Crescent and one 400 metres further West on the City West Link will have to have traffic controls set up to allow trucks to access and exit. This will lead to a big increase in congestion in this area, the main route to Anzac Bridge and Victoria Rd.

B. Unacceptable noise levels will accompany the construction of this massive interchange. No analysis has been provided of the magnitude of increased noise pollution which will adversely affect the local citizens.

C. 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.

D. The EIS states that ‘Impacts associated with property acquisition would be managed through a property acquisition support service.’ There is no reference as to how this support service will be more effective than that currently offered. There were many upset residents and businesses who did not believe they were treated in a respectful and fair manner in earlier stages. The EIS needs to include details as to lessons learned from earlier projects and how this will be improved for the M4-M5 impacted residents and businesses. (Executive Summary xviii)

E. The Darley Road site should be rejected because it involves acquiring Dan Murphy’s. This business was renovated and opened with full knowledge that it was to be acquired. The lessee and sub-lessees should not be permitted compensation in these circumstances. The demolition of the entire building (which the EIS confirms will occur) is wasteful and represents mismanagement of public resources.

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

I. 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.”

II. 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.

III. 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.

IV. 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 22 metres Hill St at 28 metres Moore St 27 metres. Piper St 37 metres (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28 metres (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.

V. The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being ‘temporary’. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

I. 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.

II. Additional facilities. The EIS states that the contractor may decide upon additional 'construction ancillary facilities' to the 12 identified in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be more unidentified sites taken, as residents will have no opportunity to comment on their impacts. The approval condition should limit any construction facilities to those already notified and detailed in the EIS.

III. 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.

IV. 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.

V. 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.

VI. 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.

VII. It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle.

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: Lucinda Williams Moore

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: 9/5 Blockwood Ave, Ashfield, NSW, 2131

Suburb: Ashfield

Postcode: 2131

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

Name: Lucinda Williams Moore

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: 9/5 Blackwood Ave

Suburb: Ashfield

Postcode: 2131

- It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle.

- 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 groundwater 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.

- 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 EIS refers to construction impacts as being ‘temporary’. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

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
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. 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.

II. 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.

III. 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 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.

IV. 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.

V. 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.

VI. 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.

VII. 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_________________________
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:

- It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle.

- 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 groundwater movement above 20 millimeters is predicted. This is not acceptable to me. 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.

- 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 EIS refers to construction impacts as being ‘temporary’. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

- 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.

- 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.

- 622 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.
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 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 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.

- 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.

- 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 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 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.

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 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.

desperation to find a reason to build it, rather than there being a clear need to be serviced.

1) Rather than ease congestion the project is likely to reduce the availability of funds for projects that enable that genuinely reduce congestion (road pricing), give priority for high productivity road users such as delivery and service vehicles or genuinely avoid congestion (public transport in separate corridors/lanes).

2) The most highly effected area of Stage 3 will be Rozelle with the massive and complex interchange. Nothing like this has been built anywhere else in the World and it is highly questionable as to whether it can be built at all in the form outlined in the EIS. The EIS does not show any detailed plans as to how this will be achieved. There are no constructional details at all, what is shown is a concept only, this is totally unacceptable.

3) There is relatively limited urban redevelopment potential along the small section of Victoria Road that the Project would decongest, and this section is not been classified by the NSW Government as redevelopment area. To claim this as a benefit is misleading.

4) Easton Park has a long history and is part of an urban environment which is unusual in Sydney. The park needs to be assessed from a visual design point of view. It will be quite a different park when its view is changed to one of a large ventilation stack. The suggestion that it has been ‘saved’ needs to be considered in the light of the severe 5 years construction impacts and the reshaped urban environment.

5) 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.

6) The EIS projects increases in freight volumes without offering evidence as to how the project enables this. Assertions relating to improvements for freight services rely on the Sydney Gateway Project, which is not part of WestConnex, and which poses significant threats to the crucial freight rail connection to Port

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 __________________________
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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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: Justin Gager

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: 30 Cannon Street

Suburb: Stanmore

Postcode: 2048

A. 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.

B. 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.

C. 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.

D. 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.

E. 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.

F. 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.

G. 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.

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.
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: Justin Cooper

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: 30 Cannon Street, Stanmore

Suburb: 

Postcode: 2048

(1) While the Rozelle interchange remains committed to be opened in December 2023, the design is so preliminary and so complex that it needs to be treated as another stage of the project to ensure that potential private sector funders are willing to invest, knowing they can heavily modify and/or defer the Rozelle Interchange.

(2) The proposed Inner West Subsurface Interchange, planned as part of Stage 1 (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1), linking the 2 mainline tunnels with the Rozelle interchange and the Iron Cove link is of serious concern, there has been little information about the Inner West Interchange, its construction or exactly which streets it would affect. At Westconnex Information sessions held in the inner west in Sept 2017 staff state the path of the tunnels and the Interchange are ‘indicative only’. How are residents expected to submit submissions without knowing if their street is affected?

(3) The project would take land intended for housing and employment specified in The Bays Precinct Transformation Plan.

(4) Significantly, there is nothing in the EIS to ensure that tunnelling would be at a sufficient depth so as not to endanger the integrity of homes, including vibration, and noise impacts. Further, without provision for full compensation for damage sustained there would be no incentive for contractors, or Roads and Maritime Services, to minimise damage to homes or indeed to have any concern for damage sustained.

(5) Given that these works could be undertaken to deliver toll paying drivers to the privately owned WestConnex, there is strong potential for a conflict between private profit and community impacts. The cost of any such integration works should very clearly be attributed to the Project cost, and should not impact on the available RMS budget for the State road network normal maintenance and improvement budget.

(6) The EIS notes that the Project would cause additional traffic congestion on a number of key roads including: Gardeners Road and Bourke Road in the south, Frederick Street (Ashfield), Johnston Street (Annandale) and numerous streets in Mascot (p.8-103). The EIS must assess and identify any upgrades that the Project will require.

(7) The proponent does not consider the impact of the Sydney Metro West. This project will have a significant impact on travel behaviour (and specifically mode share).

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.

1) 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?

2) 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.

3) 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.

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) 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.

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 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

i. 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.

ii. 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.

iii. 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)

iv. 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.

v. 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.

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 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 (iv, 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.
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: ____________________________
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: 65 Piggott St
Suburb: Dulwich Hill
Postcode: 2203

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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: Belinda Bourke
Signature: Belinda Bourke

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: 65 Pigott St, Dulwich Hill, 2203

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

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

Application Number: SSI 7485
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

♦ 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.

♦ 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 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.

♦ 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.

♦ Targets for renewable energy and carbon offsets are not aligned with NSW government policy. (Table 22-8)

♦ 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 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.

- The widening of the Crescent between the City West link and Johnston St with an extra lane being constructed will lead to heavy traffic congestion. This will be exacerbated still further by extra traffic light control cycles being incorporated into the signalling at both Johnston St and at the City West Link, with the inclusion of an extra traffic light control 400m West from the Crescent / City West Link junction to manage the movement of large numbers of spoil trucks.

- 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.

- 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 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)

- 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?
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. 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.

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.

C. I do not consider so many disruption's 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.

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 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.

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.

F. It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area, Rozelle

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.

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.

**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 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 were 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.
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.

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.

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.

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)

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)

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.

f) The traffic modelling process is not fit for purpose and places significant risks on the people of NSW in terms of:
- 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.

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

Name: [Redacted]

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: 78 Market St

Postcode: 2000

Suburb: Newtown

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.

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.

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.

The EIS states that the Rozelle interchange and the surrounds of the Anzac Bridge are currently close to capacity. With the proposed project construction the area is going to be subjected to a huge increase in vehicle movements throughout the area for 5 years. Even the ‘with project’ scenario states that this area will experience no improvement and if anything the current situation will be worse. This is totally unacceptable and proves that the whole project is a complete White Elephant. Indeed it is stated in the EIS that the only way to mitigate for this situation by 2033 is for the working population to adjust their work hours. “Due to forecast congestion, some of this traffic is predicted not to be able to start or finish their journey within the peak period. Some drivers will therefore choose to make their journey either earlier or later in the peak period to avoid delay. This behavior is called ‘peak spreading’...” This is a categorical admission of failure of this complete project and a stupendous waste of Tax Payers money.
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. 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?
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.

- 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 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

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

Name: SLYNANDON

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission.

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

Address: 51/1 COOK RD.

Suburb: CENTENNIAL PARK

♦ 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.

♦ It is clear from the EIS that spoil truck movements will not be confined to the City West Link. At a community consultation it was revealed that trucks removing spoil at Camperdown would very likely be travelling from the James Craig Rd area and in that case would be using the additional lane on the Crescent and then turning right up Johnston St. This is totally CONTRARY to what concerned residents had been promised would not happen. It is clear that any assurances given to the community in past consultations are totally disregarded without consultation later. This is unacceptable.

♦ Heart disease will skyrocket due to air pollution caused by Westconnex bringing more cars into the Inner West says Paul Torzillo, Head of Respiratory medicine at Royal Prince Albert Hospital. Inner West Courier 23rd May 2017

♦ The EIS states "that without the 'construction scenario' the City West Link/The Crescent and The Crescent/James Craig Road intersections are forecast to operate satisfactorily at LoS D or better in both Peak periods. With the 'construction scenario' the operational performance at the intersections is forecast to worsen". And after 5 years of construction and the spending of more than $18 Billion the outcome at these locations will be worse.

♦ 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 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.
Attention Director
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Name: Miguel Sanchez
Address: 58 Douglas Street
Application Number: SSI 7485
Suburb: Stanmore
Postcode 2048
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:

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

Name: [Signature]

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

Address: Suburb: [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 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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.

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 statements.

All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street) should have a blanket 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. These streets are not constructed for heavy vehicle movements and on this basis should also be ruled out. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all of these streets.

The social and economic impact study fails to record the great concern for valued Newtown heritage.

I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.

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.

Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates an 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.

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 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.

1. I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.

2. The proponent excludes the impact of the Western Sydney Airport from analysis of the project. This could have a significant impact on traffic volumes.

3. The modelling shows significant increases in traffic on Victoria Rd (+20% ADT) which is already at capacity.

4. Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

5. Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

6. The modelling shows the motorway exceeds reasonable operating limits in the peak in less than ten years.

7. The key intersection performance tables in App H (p.258 St Peters and 248 Rozelle) demonstrate that many intersections will either worsen (at the worst case scenario of LOS F) or remain unchanged particularly in 2033, including the following intersections:
   - Princes Highway/Canal Road
   - Princes Highway/Railway Road
   - Unwins Bridge Road/Campbell Street
   - Campbell Road/Bourke Road
   - Princes Highway/Campbell Street
   - Ricketty Street/Kent Road
   - Gardeners Road/Kent Road
   - Gardeners Road/Bourke Road
   - Gardeners Rd/O'Riordan Street
   - Victoria Road/Lyons Road
   - Victoria Road/Darling Street
   - Victoria Road/Robert Street

8. The underlying traffic modelling and outputs was insufficient to:
   - Demonstrate the need for the project.
   - Understand impacts of dispersed traffic on connecting roads, such as the Anzac Bridge, and whether they have available capacity to meet the predicted traffic discharge. Any congestion on exits has the capacity to negate all travel time savings to the exit point, given the small predicted benefits.

9. Public transport is rejected by the EIS so the state government is forcing us to use cars more when most major cities in the world are trying to reduce the number of cars on the roads. We know this is to promote private road operators' profits. I object to putting so much public funding to the cause of private profit. I urge the Secretary of Planning to reject this 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: ____________
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: 41 LEICHHARDT ST
Suburb: LEICHHARDT
Postcode: 2040

- 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 ____________________
Submission from:
Name: Kay Williams
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: 95A Douglas St
Suburb: Stanmore
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
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons,

a) 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.

b) 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.

c) The EIS is misleading because it discusses the creation of 14,350 direct jobs during construction. It omits the fact that jobs have also been lost because of acquisition of businesses, many of which were long-standing and employed hundreds of workers. (Executive Summary xviii)

d) 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.

e) 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.

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.
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 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, 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.

- 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.

- The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed. 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 in 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.

- 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 $20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.

- 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 duration 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Max Horn

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: 37 Any Street

Suburb: Croydon Park

Postcode: 2037

1) 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?

2) 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.

3) 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.

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) 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.

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 Horn

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: 37 Any St

Suburb: Erskineville

Postcode: 2043

1. 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.

2. I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.

3. 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 Ms/M5 tunnel would further add to this loss.

4. The basic question that the people of NSW need answered by the EIS is For the same or lower cost of the project, could we do something that is different to the project that will deliver outcomes that are as good or better? The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARS) require analysis of feasible alternatives to the project. No feasible alternatives have been developed and no objective analysis of alternatives has been undertaken. While Section 4.4 of the EIS purports to cover Strategic Alternatives, it does little more than offer a discussion of why an alternative was not pursued.

5. I specifically object to the removal of the lighting tower and the Port Authority Building. These items are of considerable local significance and are representative of the operation of the Rozelle Rail Yards in the first part of the 20th century. I do not agree with trashing industrial history when it could be put to good community use.

6. The EIS misrepresents the structure of the Global Economic Corridor and overstates the relationship of the project to centres within it by claiming the Project serves centres in the north of the GEC that it does not.

7. The cited 'key customers' that would benefit from the project (long distance, freight, businesses) represent a very small minority of those who are forecast to actually use the project (single occupancy commuter vehicles). The key customers could be served by a far more modest project, given they represent an extremely small proportion of projected traffic on 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 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) The USA, UK and European states are more and more concerned about the bad effects of car emissions on people’s health and are taking steps to tougher emission standards. Here the state government is promoting car use at the expense of public health concerns. I object to the WestConnex project because of the increased car emissions it will cause.

b) 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.

c) The original stated objective of Westconnex had as its fundamental objective the connecting to Port Botany. The original objective was the improvement of freight access to the Airport and Port Botany. Stage 1, 2 and 3 do not achieve this goal and this is not addressed in the EIS.

d) The EIS asserts that WestConnex will be a catalyst for urban renewal along major corridors. No evidence is provided to back this assertion. The Sydney experience suggests that roads don’t - this is not a likely catalyst e.g. Canterbury Road after M5 East; Cumberland Highway corridor after the M7.

e) 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.

f) Heart disease will skyrocket due to air pollution caused by Westconnex bringing more cars into the Inner West says Paul Torzillo, Head of Respiratory medicine at Royal Prince Albert Hospital. Inner West Courier 23rd May 2017
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:

- 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.

- 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.

- 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?

- 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.

- 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.

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

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

Name: Liam Taylor
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: 96 Anson Avenue, Suburb: Leichhardt
Postcode: 2232

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.

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 MS 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 statements.

All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to falls Street) should have a blanket 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. These streets are not constructed for heavy vehicle movements and on this basis should also be ruled out. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements including parking and worker parking on all of these streets.

The social and economic impact study fails to record the great concern for valued Newtown heritage.

I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.

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.

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.

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 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/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?**

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

Name: Michael Rodgers
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: 282 PROBERT ST
Suburb: NEWTOWN
Postcode: 2042

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

Name: MARIA WILSON

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 NORTH ST

Suburb: MARRICKVILLE Postcode 2207

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 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.

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

- 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.

- 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.

- 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 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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?

- I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

- 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.

- Other comments:

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

Name: [Redacted]
Signature: [Redacted]

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: [Redacted]
Suburb: [Redacted]
Postcode: 2201

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 __________________________
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.

1. 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.

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.

4. It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area, Rozelle.

5. 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.

2. 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)

3. 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)

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. I strongly object to this process. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS.

I strongly 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 therefore be rejected because it does not have evidence to show it could work.

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. I am very concerned about the health of children and adults if this goes ahead. 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.
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.

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)

Reducions 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 claims.

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, Rebecca White 1 Walker Ave Mascot

This email was sent by Rebecca White 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 Rebecca provided an email address (rebeccafreedmansmith@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rebecca White at rebeccafreedmansmith@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 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: Rebecca White
Signature: R White

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 Walker Ave, Mascot, NSW 2020

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

Name: J. NAVRUTT

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: Go Kyly St

Suburb: TEMPE

Postcode: 2044

- The EIS states that 'Impacts associated with property acquisition would be managed through a property acquisition support service.' There is no reference as to how this support service will be more effective than that currently offered. There were many upset residents and businesses who did not believe they were treated in a respectful and fair manner in earlier stages. The EIS needs to include details as to lessons learned from earlier projects and how this will be improved for the M4-M5 impacted residents and businesses. (Executive Summary xviii)

- 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.

- At very minimum, the assessment of Strategic Alternative 1 (improvements to the existing arterial road network) should:
  - Identify key network capacity issues.
  - Develop a scenario of investments in (potentially major) arterial road improvements required to address the road network capacity constraints. The City of Sydney's alternative scheme provides one example of what improvements to the existing arterial road network might look like.

- Carry out transport modelling and economic analysis to inform the assessment of the alternative.

- 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.

- I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

- 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.

- 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
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: [Signed]

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: M5/147 McEvoy St

Suburb: ALEXANDRIA

Postcode: 2015

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 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: [Signature]
Address: [Signature]
Suburb: [Signature]
Postcode: [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.

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

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 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.

1) I note that in the area of Lilyfield Rd and Gordon Street, the work proposed which would include deep excavation that would result in major adverse impacts on archaeological remains, while other surface works would have localised impacts on archaeological remains that may be present. It is suggested that what are called ‘management measures’ would be carried out including the development of a Historical Archaeological Research Design which would include an “assessment of any detailed design plans to develop a methodology and scope for a program of test excavation to determine the nature, condition and extent of potential archaeological remains.” This is completely unacceptable to me. The community will have no right to any input into this plan or access to independent expert advice. This is all part of an ‘approve now, research later’ approach that will lead to poorly planned unnecessary destruction, a loss of potential community history and understanding.

2) It is quite clear to me that insufficient research has been done on the archeology of the Rozelle Railway yards. This could be a valuable archeology site. Why has an EIS been put forward without the necessary research being done to further identify potential remains? No project should be approved on the basis of such an inadequate level of research.

3) 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.

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

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 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 in 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.
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. The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed. 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 fn 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.

II. 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.

III. 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.

IV. 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.’ 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.

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 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) 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.

b) 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.

c) 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.

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

Name: .................................................................
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: 37/37 Redfern St, Newtown, 2042

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.
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. 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: 37/37 Leecave St, Newtown 2042

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

I OBJECT

I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 48 Enmore Rd, Enmore, NSW 2042

Suburb: Enmore

Name: Emily Night

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.

a. 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.

b. The EIS states "that without the 'construction scenario' the City West Link/The Crescent and The Crescent/James Craig Road intersections are forecast to operate satisfactorily at LoS D or better in both Peak periods. With the 'construction scenario' the operational performance at the intersections is forecast to worsen". And after 5 years of construction and the spending of more than $18 Billion the outcome at these locations will be worse.

c. 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 a high accident rate and is completely unsuitable for such a purpose.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. 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.

g. There are estimated 100 heavy and 70 light vehicle movements a day and the plan is to allow a right-hand turn into Darley Road from the CW Link. The trucks will drive onto Darley Road, turn right into the site and then left back out onto the CW Link, which is unrealistic given the amount of traffic on these roads now.

h. The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors.

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

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

Name: KAYLE SALISBURY

Signature: KAYLE S

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: 3/20 DENNIS ST

Suburb: CALEMBA

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: 3/20 DENNIS ST

Suburb: CALEMBA

Postcode: 2495

a) 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 "reviewed 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).

b) 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 Parramatta Rd. The current proposal which provides for 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road should not be approved and approval should only be given to the alternative proposal I repeat however my objection to the selection of this site altogether, but propose the least worst impact should be chosen if this site is to be used.

c) 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?

d) 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.

e) The EIS states that an alternative truck movement is proposed which involves use of the City West Link and no need for spoil trucks to access Darley Road. This proposal is supported, subject to further information about potential impacts being provided. The EIS should not be approved on its current basis which provides for 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road on a daily basis. This will create unacceptable safety issues and noise impacts for adjacent homes while also compromising pedestrian and bicycle access to the light rail and bay run. It will also lead to truck chaos on this critical arterial road providing access to and across the City west Link. The current proposal which provides for truck movements solely on Darley Road should not be approved and approval should only be given to the alternative proposal. I repeat however my objection to the selection of this site altogether, but propose the least worst impact should be chosen if this site is to be used.

f) 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.
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. 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.

2. 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)

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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)
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Kyle Galloway
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: 7/29 Dennis St
Suburb: Lakemba
Postcode: 2175

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

I. The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed. 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 fn 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.

II. 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.

III. 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.

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

Name: KATE SALTSBURY
Signature: 

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

Address: 7/29 Dennis St
Suburb: Lakemba
Postcode: 2195

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
Submission from:

Name: Kyle Sahli

Signature: Kyle Sahli
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Address: 7129 Dammit St

Suburb: Lakemba

Postcode: 2195

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.

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

Name: ......................................................... Kylee Salesbury

Signature: ................................................... Kylee Salesbury

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: .................................................... 71/29 Dennis St

Suburb: ....................................................... Lakemba

Postcode: .................................................... 2195

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 sickness 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 ____________________________
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 McLennan

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 Adams Ave

Suburb: Malabar Postcode 2036

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.

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 for the following reasons:

I. 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.

II. Additional facilities. The EIS states that the contractor may decide upon additional ‘construction ancillary facilities’ to the 12 identified in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be more unidentified sites taken, as residents will have no opportunity to comment on their impacts. The approval condition should limit any construction facilities to those already notified and detailed in the EIS.

III. I am concerned that while hundreds of impacts on residents, 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.

IV. 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.

V. 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; 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.

VI. 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.

VII. It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle
Submission from: Charles Brooks

Address: 103 Angel St

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

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 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 were 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: Charles Brookes

Signature: Charles Brookes

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: NSW

Suburb: Rozelle

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.

It is clear from the EIS that spoil truck movements will not be confined to the City West Link. At a community consultation it was revealed that trucks removing spoil at Camperdown would very likely be travelling from the James Craig Rd area and in that case would be using the additional lane on the Crescent and then turning right up Johnston St. This is totally CONTRARY to what concerned residents had been promised would not happen. It is clear that any assurances given to the community in past consultations are totally disregarded without consultation later. This is unacceptable.

Heart disease will skyrocket due to air pollution caused by Westconnex bringing more cars into the Inner West says Paul Torzillo, Head of Respiratory medicine at Royal Prince Albert Hospital. Inner West Courier 23rd May 2017

The EIS states “that without the ‘construction scenario’ the City West Link/The Crescent and The Crescent/James Craig Road intersections are forecast to operate satisfactorily at LoS D or better in both Peak periods. With the ‘construction scenario’ the operational performance at the intersections is forecast to worsen”. And after 5 years of construction and the spending of more than $18 Billion the outcome at these locations will be worse.

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

I. It is stated that if congestion proves to be a problem then other solutions will have to be found. Other routes that are being considered will be using the Western Distributor, the Crescent, Victoria Rd, Ross St, Pyrmont Bridge Rd and Johnston St. The Crescent and Johnston St are clearly going to be used. This despite the fact that in a consultation those representing Westconnex assured residents of Annandale that neither Johnston St or Booth St would be used. It is expected that these routes will also be used for night transport. It is clear that it is unlikely that transportation routes shown in the EIS will be adhered to. This is unacceptable.

II. 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?

III. 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.

IV. 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.

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 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 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.

- 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 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.

- 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.

- It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle.

---

**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 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.

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 statements.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

4. It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle.

4. 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.

4. 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.

4. The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being ‘temporary’. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

4. 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.

4. 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.

4. 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.

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 applicationSSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Pat McNamara

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: 59 Balmain Rd., Balmain, NSW 2041

Postcode: 2041

Suburb: Balmain

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.

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 EIS refers to construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

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.

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.

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.

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: 

001367-M00003
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.

1) 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.

2) 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.

3) 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.

4) 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)

5) 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.

6) 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)

7) 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 ___________________________
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

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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 or not.

4. 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)

5. 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.

6. 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)

7. 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 ____________________________
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. It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle

B. 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.

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. The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being ‘temporary’. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

E. 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.

F. 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.

G. 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.

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 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. 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.

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.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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?
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: ............................................................

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: ............................................................

Suburb: ............................................................. Postcode: ............................................................

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?

- 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.

- Permanent substation and water treatment plant - Residents on Darley Rd opposite the site and residents in Hubert St will have a direct line of sight 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 sight 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.

- 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 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.

- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states “...... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies

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 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.

Installation of a permanent motorway operations complex – Leichhardt:

I. 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.

Tunnel depths – Leichhardt:

II. Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates an 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.

Ventilation facilities:

III. 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.

Impact on safe walking and riding to schools – Leichhardt:

IV. 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. 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.
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 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.

2. 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.

3. The EIS at 7-51 refers to concerns that were raised by the community that the alignment of tunnels in Newtown appeared to go to the east of King Street, an area that had had no geotech drilling or testing. SMC staff indicated at Community information sessions that the maps included in the Concept Design were broad and indicative only, and that further details would be available in the EIS. No further details have been provided. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

4. The EIS at 7-41 acknowledges that there is great concern in the community that King Street, Newtown, will be made a 24-hour clearway, stating “Roads and Maritime has no plan to change the existing clearways on King Street”. This statement is deliberately misleading, inferring SMC has authority over regional roads. Roads and Maritime have the unfettered right to declare Clearways wherever/whenever and RMS has NEVER stated publicly that King St will not be subject to clearways.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

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 taking into account long term sustainability over short-term private profit.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: .............................................
Signature: ...........................................

Please include (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: .............................................
Suburb: .............................................
Postcode: ..........................................

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 ..........................
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.

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 witnessed 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 rethink the transport planning for the whole metropolitan area with active consideration and comparison of heavy and light rail alternatives.

I would like to assist and/or keep up to date with the anti-Westconnex campaign - These details will be removed before lodging this submission, and will be used only for campaign purposes and will not be divulged to other parties.

Name __________________________________________ Email ____________________________ Mobile ____________________________
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the Environmental Impact Statement M4/M5 application, for the following reasons:

1. SMC has 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.

2. 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 until critical 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.

3. At 7-25 the EIS 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.

4. The EIS acknowledges at 7-41 that there is great concern in the community that King Street, Newtown, will be made a 24-hour clearway, stating "Roads and Maritime has no plan to change the existing clearways on King Street". This statement is deliberately misleading - it infers that SMC has authority in controlling impacts on regional roads. Roads and Maritime have the unfettered right to declare Clearways wherever and whenever they wish, and RMS has NEVER stated publicly that King Street will not be subject to extended clearways.

5. The EIS at 7-51 refers to concerns that were raised by the community that the alignment of tunnels in Newtown appeared to go to the east of King Street, an area that had had no geotech testing. SMC staff indicated at Community information sessions that the maps included in the Concept Design were broad and indicative only, and that further details would be available in the EIS. There are no further details provided. Again, this casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

6. 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.

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 ____________________
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.

1. 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)

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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)

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 whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the Environmental Impact Statement M4/M5 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 idea 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 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

For these and many other reasons, I urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to reject 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: 
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: 
Suburb: 
Postcode: 

- 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.
- The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors.
- 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.
- 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 7-41 acknowledges that there is great concern in the community that King Street, Newtown, will be made a 24 hour clearway, stating “Roads and Maritime has no plan to change the existing clearways on King Street”. This statement is deliberately misleading - it infers that SMC has authority in controlling impacts on regional roads. Roads and Maritime have the unfettered right to declare Clearways wherever and whenever they wish, and RMS has NEVER stated publicly that King Street will not be subject to extended clearways.
- 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?
- There are estimated 100 heavy and 70 light vehicle movements a day and the plan is to allow a right-hand turn into Darley Road from the CW Link. The trucks will drive onto Darley Road, turn right into the site and then left back out onto the CW Link, which is unrealistic given the amount of traffic on these roads now.
- 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.
- 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?
- 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
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:

- 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 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 groundwater 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.

- 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 EIS refers to construction impacts as being ‘temporary’. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

- It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle

- 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.

- 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.
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.

- 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.

- 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 cavern 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.

- 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 Prince's Highway, King St, Edgeware and Enmore Roads and through the streets of Enmore and Alexandria.

- 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?

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 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.

◊ The EIS states that a Construction traffic and Access Management plan (CTAMP) would be prepared to minimise delays and disruptions and identify changes to ensure road safety. The plans are not in the EIS so residents cannot comment. The EIs should be rejected on the basis that the impacts on traffic and safety are not adequately addressed. It is inadequate to simply refer to a plan, with no provision for residents and other key stakeholders to be involved in its development.

◊ The EIS provides that Darley Road traffic will increase by 4% following the completion of the project in 2022. There is no benefit for residents flowing from this project. It is unacceptable that Leichhardt residents, particularly those close to Darley Road, will be forced to endure years of highly intrusive construction impacts and then derive no benefit from the project. The EIS states that the road network will improve once the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link opens, which means that residents will have to endure worsened traffic conditions for up to 10 years. While the traffic on the City West Link is forecast to decrease by up to 40 per cent once the project is completed, this is based on commuters electing to use the tollways. There is limited evidence to support these statistics and it is likely that many people will choose to use local roads to avoid the toll which will result in significant rat-running. There is no plan in the EIS to manage this issue.

◊ The EIS states that 'some surface works’ would need to be carried out out-of-hours to minimise traffic disruptions or for safety or operational reasons'. Given that Darley Road is a known accident black spot and is highly congested, particularly at peak periods, it is likely that there will be frequent out-of-hours work. This will create an unacceptable impact on those living close to the site. There are an estimated 36 homes that will suffer severe noise impacts and out of hours work will adversely affect their amenity of life. In addition, it is likely to lead to additional road closures and diversions, placing pressure on the local traffic network. No out-of-hours work should be permitted except in the case of a true emergency. The EIS as drafted effectively permits out of hours to be undertaken whenever this is convenient to the contractor (Executive Summary xiv).

◊ The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. Activities identified include earthworks, demolition of existing structures and site establishment and utility adjustments. The Darley Road site will suffer unacceptable construction impacts due to the need to demolish the large Dan Murphy's building and the EIS notes that 10 weeks of demolition and road adjustment works will be needed. There are no additional mitigation measures proposed for residents during this period such as temporary relocation, noise walls or treatments for individual homes. 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. (Executive Summary, xiv) We object to the selection of this site on the basis that the works required (demolition and surface works) will create unbearable noise and vibration impacts and make over 30 homes unlivable and there are NO additional mitigation plans for these residents.
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.

Trucks on local streets – Leichhardt:

a) 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.

Acquisition of Dan Murphys site – Leichhardt:

b) The Darley Road site should be rejected because it involves acquiring Dan Murphy’s. This business was renovated and opened with full knowledge that it was to be acquired. The lessee and sub-lessees should not be permitted compensation in these circumstances. The demolition of the entire building (which the EIS confirms will occur) is wasteful and represents mismanagement of public resources.

Truck routes – Leichhardt:

c) 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.

Alternative access route for trucks – Leichhardt:

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

Name: ____________________________
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: __________________________
Suburb: __________________________
Postcode: ____________

a) 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?

b) 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.

c) 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 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.

d) It is 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.

f) 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.

g) 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.

h) 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) 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.

j) 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.

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
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

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

This submission is an OBJECTION to the entire WestConnex proposal, including the New M4/M5 Link (Stage 3) which is the subject of the current Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 16_7485M4/M5 Link.

Any statements in this submission which refer to amelioration of predicted impacts should not be interpreted as endorsement or support for any aspect of Westconnex. It is my position that it is clear from this EIS and those in relation to Stage 1 and Stage 2, that the impacts of Westconnex are unacceptable and cannot be managed in any manner that is acceptable. For the reasons set out in this submission, I do not believe that the EIS meets the Secretary’s Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARS) and therefore no part of the EIS should be approved.

This statement of OBJECTION raises a number of specific objections to the current EIS which taken together clearly demonstrate the unacceptability of Westconnex Stage 3. These are set out below.

EIS should be rejected as it is ‘Indicative only’. The EIS does not provide any definitive plans and reads more like an outline of a possibly proposal rather than a statement of environment impacts. With only indicative plans it is impossible to make any clear assessment of the impacts of Stage 3. There is no set design and therefore no set impacts, all are indicative. At the same time the likely impacts of what is being proposed across a range of indicators are horrendous and the EIS should not be approved. The EIS repeatedly 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.’ For this reason alone, NSW Planning must not approve this project as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and therefore provides no proper basis on which the impacts of the project can be assessed. If approved, it will demonstrate that this consultation process is a shameful display of disdain for the impacted communities. It is not acceptable to leave things to the contractor, ONCE THE PROJECT HAS BEEN APPROVED, to come up with the details that may or may not reflect the indicative plan included in this EIS. This would mean that the project goes ahead with no public scrutiny or possibility of comment on the actual plan and any changes the contractor puts forward. As such the EIS 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. The effect of this uncertainty is that local community members, local Councils and community organisations, will be unable to undertake monitor compliance as the conditions in the EIS are indicative only and final plans will not be scrutinised.

Failure to meet stated strategic objective A clear reason to object to this EIS is that Stage 3 has failed to provide evidence that WestConnex will meet its primary objective of providing a direct motorway connection between Western Sydney and Sydney Airport and Port Botany. Given the St Peters Interchange has been for no logical reason been located at St Peters rather than close to the airport; and given the Camperdown exit has been removed from the M4/M5 Link it is hard to understand what now is the role of the M4/M5 Link. It is certainly not made clear in the EIS.

Lack of consideration of alternatives Under the Secretary’s requirements, the EIS is supposed to provide an analysis of alternatives, including potential public transport alternatives (SEARS 2 (e)). The EIS has failed to meet this requirement. There is broad brush discussion about the need for the project without any detailed analysis of why other solutions including the one developed by the City of Sydney could not be pursued. Aside from not meeting the requirements for the EIS, this demonstrates that the government is set on a path to build this tunnel (and sell off the project) no matter what the impacts. This is not acceptable and I strongly object to public monies being used with so little scrutiny and assessment and failure to follow proper process.
Long lasting inequitable impacts ignored in EIS The project will increase intergenerational equity by failing to provide public transport alternatives, embedding car dependency in areas of Sydney that are not adequately served with public transport and discriminating against those who cannot afford to pay tolls. People will be forced to choose between spending an increasing proportion of income on tolls or travelling on slower congested routes. The EIS acknowledges that the project would have a legacy of traffic congestions which means that whole communities would not only have had their quality of life severely impacted by construction for up to eight years, but those same communities will be left with the health impacts of traffic congestion. Business case does not justify moving to this EIS SGS Economics and Planning was commissioned by the City of Sydney to undertake an analysis of the Updated Business Case, which the NSW government reluctantly released in late 2015. SGS found that • the Business case found a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) as 1.71 when it should have been 1.64. • the construction costs appear too conservative – if these were to increase, the BCR would reduce accordingly. (This is particularly relevant to Stage 3 because the construction costs of the Rozelle Interchange would be huge because of the design and technical challenges of building overlapping tunnels underground. Also the Sydney Gateway was originally part of the project but has now been moved out of WestConnex.) • modelling for post-2031 conditions was not undertaken, however benefits were assumed to continue until 2052. • the Business Case did not reflect global approaches to congestion management, such as transit investment and demand management. • the Business Case suggested WestConnex would help renew Parramatta Road by reducing traffic on it, despite the modelling showing that many parts of it would carry more traffic, not less. • travel time savings were a key component of the positive BCR. A significant number of these suppose benefits that were supposed to arise from travel time savings were within the margin of error of modelling, or were so small that motorists might not notice them (and therefore would not value them). In fact as a result of considering these and other factors, SGS consulting found that the actual BCR of the project could be less than 1:1, with NSW taxpayers exposed to the risk that the project may not succeed. Read the full SGS Consulting Report or other reports on the SGS critique of the WestConnex business case can be found here and here

Business case, costs and benefits The EIS relies on the WestConnex business case which contains serious errors that are carried into the EIS. In assessing the social and economic impacts, the EIS for Stage 3 failsto account of many of the costs including: • cost the reductions in public transport, especially the loss of fare revenue. • loss of heritage to the whole community (not just property owners) • road widening that is made necessary by traffic congestion exacerbated by WestConnex

It seems very clear that by removing certain aspects of the plan (for example the Sydney Gateway) the NSW government is currently falsely holding the costs of WestConnex to $16.8 billion while it moves towards privatisation. The total costs are likely to be closer to the City of Sydney’s estimate of $45 billion or more. If the real costs were included in the EDIS it is likely that the Benefit/Cost Ratio of WestConnex would be less than 1:1. It is not acceptable for NSW Planning to exclude this important point from its assessment because these cost benefit assumptions are clearly built into the EIS.

Lack of transparency I strongly object to the public consultation where so much is withheld or hidden from the public and there is so much uncertainty in the EIS. This particularly relates to the omission of significant and relevant information from Chapter 4 of the M4-M5 EIS, particularly in relation to Haberfield Option A and B. These omissions make Chapter 4 and the entire EIS incomplete and not ready for exhibition, assessment, or approval.

• False and misleading or omitted information brings into question the validity of the entire M4-M5 EIS. All chapters, appendices and annexures of EIS rely upon the accuracy of project development background information as presented in Chapter 4. If Chapter 4 is inaccurate and inadequate, then so is the rest of the EIS.

• Specifically, what is presented in the M4-M5 EIS is false and misleading due to no mention or consideration of what occurred during the M4 East exhibition, assessment and approval process, – and how this background information and WestConnex project knowledge relates to the current M4-M5 application.

• What was promised to the community during the M4 East Concept phase (2013-14) and M4 East EIS exhibition phase in (2015-16), was that there would be no above ground construction sites in Haberfield and Ashfield after 2019 – except if the M4-M5 were to be approved. If the M4-5 were approved, then only limited construction work would be required to fit out of the M4-M5 ventilation stack, as well as use of the M4-M5 entry and entry ramps along Wattle St, between Parramatta Rd and Ramsay St, Haberfield.

• When the WestConnex M4 East project was approved in February 2016, the M4-M5 (Stage 3) ventilation facilities and exhaust chimney, the M4-M5 ‘blind portal’ entry and entry surface ramps, and the M4-M5 mainline tunnel stubs were also designed and included to be constructed as part of the M4 East project.
• The M4-M5 exhaust stack is currently being built onsite as part of the M4 East Parramatta Rd Ventilation Facility (PRVF) opposite Bunnings, the M4-M5 entry and exit surface ramps are currently being built along Wattle St, Haberfield between Parramatta Rd and Ramsay St, Haberfield, and the M4-M5 mainline tunnel stubs are being tunnelled and will end deep underground around 142-144 Alt St, Haberfield.

• What was promised at the time of M4 East EIS exhibition and approval was that if the M4-M5 were to be approved (as predicted by SMC/WDA), there would be no need any above ground construction sites in Haberfield and Ashfield. This promise was repeated and reiterated from 2013 until recently, and was said to be being both reasonable and technically feasible.

• This promise was also actively used, in 2015/2016, to justify the significantly changed design and expansion of the Wattle St interchange in the M4East EIS, from what was presented to the community during the M4 East Concept Plan information sessions in 2013/2014.

• This promise of no M4-M5 above ground construction sites in Haberfield or Ashfield has subsequently been used as the basis for asking for community and resident ‘patience’ for the promised ‘temporary’ duration of WestConnex M4 East construction activity. This M4East construction is currently causing significant and adverse health, well-being, social and business impacts in Haberfield and Ashfield.

• 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.

Western Sydney and lack of need for the stage 3 of WestConnex. The state government and the Minister for Western Sydney and WestConnex make much of the supposed benefits of the WestConnex project to the people of Western Sydney. The original purpose of the WestConnex project we are told was to improve and extend the M4 motorway and to connect the M5 to Port Botany and to Sydney Airport. Improving the road system for trucking freight was supposed to be the principal purpose. This was to benefit the whole greater Sydney region and especially the working population of Western Sydney with the greatly improved links across the metropolitan area to Sydney’s port and airport. The proposed link between the two motorways duplicates the A3, a national road which would be improved by an upgrade but does not appear to need duplication many kilometres further east. The eastern link between the M4 and M5 doesn’t offer any obvious benefits to drivers in from western Sydney. Neither stage 2 or 3 goes to Port Botany or to the airport, so I conclude it is no longer a core element of the Westconnex project. This begs the question – what is the purpose of the WestConnex project, particularly Stage 3. The answer seems to be to connect to the mooted western harbour tunnel, an unfunded or planned project which, apart from other considerations, Labor has said they oppose. If so, this stage of WestConnex has nothing to do with the interests or needs of the people of Western Sydney.

Westconnex Stage 3 and the Sydney Gateway Neither the new M5 (needed for the large trucks which cannot use the existing M5) nor the stage 3 tunnels go to Port Botany. I understand there is a separate, private, project proposal, the Sydney Gateway, for an additional tollway to move freight from the port to distribution centres further inland or directly to final destination (see Section 4.1.4 EIS Project development and alternatives). If this proceeds, finally there will be a direct link to the port and the airport, but I understand it will be separately tolled, on top of the already high tolls on the new WestConnex roads. It is misleading to claim improvement in freight movement based on the Sydney Gateway as a benefit of this project. It will not provide direct access for private cars to the airport. Instead the new M5 to the St Peters interchange at and the stage 3 link’s tunnels – if they fulfil expectations of numbers of vehicles using them – will deliver 1000s of vehicles into the roads to the airport which are already at capacity. If the state government were to buy out the private owners of the Sydney airport rail line and remove the massive impost on the tickets, private car traffic to and from the airport would drop by a third, according to transport logistics experts who have addressed public meetings about the Westconnex project in the past two years. This would do more to reduce traffic congestion in the St Peters-Mascot area than any other measure and obviate the need for the connection with WestConnex. The EIS discussion of the strategic need (chapter 3) states a number of outcomes from Stage 3 but nearly all of them depend on other road projects not part of WestConnex (eg, the Sydney Gateway or the western harbour tunnel).

Tolls are inequitable Despite no evidence of Westconnex’s benefits to Western Sydney road users, they will pay the highest tolls because the tolls themselves are distance-based. The EIS admits the tolls are inequitable because on
average, households in Western Sydney have lower incomes than in the eastern suburbs and they have fewer, adequate public transport alternatives. The EIS also admits that it is known people on lower incomes will drive further to avoid the tolls. This means they do not get any benefits from the (allegedly) faster tollways. It is clear from the response to the newly imposed tolls on the M4 that people are rejecting the supposed benefits of the newly widened road and turning instead to the untolled congested Parramatta Rd. This suggests the tolls are already higher than people think are value for money. The tolls are set to increase by 4% or the CPI whichever is higher. In an era of stagnant or declining wages and precarious employment the built-in rising cost of the tolls is an outrageous impost on people already on lower incomes than the eastern and northern suburbs. What will the effect of ever higher tolls? Running will be the most likely outcome, to avoid the tolled roads, and therefore we can expect increased traffic on the free roads and worse congestion on roads like Parramatta Rd. This will make things worse for Western Sydney road users. I object to the EIS's citing studies of the alleged benefits of tollways as support for the imposition of tolls when those studies conducted by the accounting firms, Ernst and Young and KPMG, were ordered and paid for by the corporation which owns and operates more tollways than any other single entity in NSW. This is not an independent source and undermines the credibility of the already very limited discussion of the tolls' impact. No one would be surprised to find the studies assert: “NSW’s toll roads have directly contributed $14 billion in economic, social and environmental benefits over 10 years” (Road tolling. 8.6.3 p.162). There are no details of how their studies arrived at the findings so it is not possible make an independent assessment of them. We are left guessing what is considered a social or environmental benefit since there is nothing offered to support the assertions. Tolls are supposed to lead to “alterations to ... reduced or redirected emissions, reduced traffic accidents, vehicle operation cost savings” but there is no evidence provided of how these effects are achieved. While the new roads are tolled and the old routes remain free, there is every incentive for drivers to use the old routes and save their money. When people are on wages increasing at a historically low rate, saving money is likely to be a more significant motive than this discussion recognises. This effect is evidently not taken into account when assessing the impact of the overall project in operation on driving patterns because the EIS predicts “no major shifts in daily forecast traffic onto alternative, parallel routes” (Appendix H Technical Working Paper, Traffic and transport). This is simply not credible. The section refers to finding community concern in a consultation, but this is dismissed with this assertion: “Although road tolling would be a cost to individuals, the benefits of tolling to the broader economy is (sic) a greater socio-economic consequence. Effects would be long-term and benefit the Greater Sydney Region.” (Appendix H, p.163.) In other words the people on lower incomes in western Sydney with fewer public transport alternatives than further east are being asked to pay more for driving, to reduce congestion on roads for the benefit of greater Sydney!

Opportunity costs of WestConnex The alternatives to the WestConnex project get scant consideration in an assessment evidently determined to find in favour of the tollway. I understood that the EIS is supposed to discuss alternatives to building the proponent's referred option so they can be given the detailed scrutiny which enables the public to assess them on the same basis as the tollway project. This has not happened. One example: upgrading the A3 as an alternative to the M4-M5 link is not discussed, modelled or costed although the section admits that the intersection of King Georges Road rebuilt as part of the new M5 project is expected to improve capacity on the A3. Another possible alternative, upgrading and extending the passenger train service alternative for Western Sydney — which is the preferred alternative of commuters travelling to the CBD from Western Sydney — is dismissed thus: “A stopping study to better understand the need, timing and service options for rail investment to support western Sydney and the Western Sydney Airport” [is underway] p.4.18. but no estimate of cost offered. The improvement of the public heavy rail train services by upgrading of tracks and the signalling system is not canvassed at all. Only the (private) Sydney metro and light rail extensions are mentioned, with high capital costs or none cited. Since these are all private developments it is not clear why their capital costs are relevant. The impact of these new services on passenger/commuter needs is not included in assessing the need for the WestConnex project in this discussion. The bus service discussion is focused on moving commuters west to east as a mass transit alternative and dismisses local and suburban services in three sentences which are all about Parramatta Rd. One of the obvious future needs, if the growth of the broader Western Sydney Employment Area and south-west Sydney is indeed boosted by the second airport and improved freight links, is local bus services for local workers. Bus service needs further west than Parramatta are not mentioned. The discussion of active transport (cycling and cycle paths mostly) also goes no further west than Parramatta. Demand management is dismissed as either taking too long to have an effect, or it is dependent on psychology, or the demographics are against it. This is not a serious discussion of using pricing or other measures to encourage people to time their road use differently or change transport modes. On the other hand the experience already of the impact of the new tolls on the widened M4 demonstrates the real effect of pricing signals. In each instance the alternatives are discussed dismissively and separately so a mixture of measures to reduce traffic congestion or improve transport performance is not even suggested let alone considered in detail. Given the vast sums of public money put into building this project the opportunity costs of WestConnex are significant for decades to come. For a fraction of this expenditure, improving the heavy rail system could have been studied, designed and implemented. A proper assessment of the effects of relocating the freight movement hub, associated employment
including manufacturing, and of support services would have concluded there was more need for local public transport and active transport in western Sydney than tunnels around the Sydney CBD. Implementation of extending light rail in the Parramatta corridor which would encourage genuine urban renewal has been set back by decades in favour of what threatens to become a white elephant. The people of western Sydney are entitled to feel short-changed by the decisions to build the first 2 stages of WestConnex and will gain nothing but high tolls for two generations from the third stage.

I urge the Secretary of Planning to reject this ill-considered EIS and send back the proposal for stage 3 of WestConnex to the proponent for a complete review and new business case before re-submitting the EIS.

Lack of transparency and improper handling of public moneys Acquisition of Dan Murphy’s I strongly object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphy’s 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. It is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site. I refer NSW Planning to a number of media articles and questions in parliament. At the feedback sessions on the Concept Design in 2016, the M4/M5 team were asked for information about the construction sites. Journalists and residents were given conflicting information on different days. This lack of transparency is one of many examples of secrecy and lack of straightforward communication on the part of SMC which reflects a failure to comply with ‘meaningful consultation’ as required for this EIS to be accepted by the Secretary of NSW Planning.

Serious probity issues have been raised about the dealings with this site and the Premier has now been referred to the Independent Commission Against Corruption in relation to this matter. Until the legitimacy of the acquisition of this site for the M4-M5 Link has been independently determined, the Dept of Planning cannot approve this EIS, of which this site is an intrinsic part. This is yet another reason why this stage SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED.

Traffic congestion gets worse 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. This is not acceptable as part of an EIS.

The EIS also states “that without the ‘construction scenario’ the City West Link/The Crescent and The Crescent/James Craig Road intersections are forecast to operate satisfactorily at LoS D or better in both Peak periods. With the ‘construction scenario’ the operational performance at the intersections is forecast to worsen”. And after 5 years of construction and the spending of more than $18 Billion the outcome at these locations will be worse. This is not acceptable.

According to the EIS, in relation to 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”.

In the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, not only does the proposed Stage 3 not address this issue but in fact the construction traffic associated with Stage 3 will force the traffic beyond capacity for much of the construction period of 5 years. Beyond this, 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 not about improving traffic flows and in fact will be contributing to traffic problems in this area.

The widening of the Crescent between the City West link and Johnston St with an extra lane being constructed will lead to heavy traffic congestion. This will be exacerbated still further by extra traffic light control cycles being incorporated into the signaling at both Johnston St and at the City West Link, with the inclusion of an extra traffic light control 400m West from the Crescent/City West Link junction to manage the movement of large numbers of spoil trucks.
As indicated above, the EIS states that the Rozelle interchange and the surrounds of the Anzac Bridge are currently close to capacity. With the proposed project construction the area is going to be subjected to a huge increase in vehicle movements throughout the area for 5 years. Even the ‘with project’ scenario states that this area will experience no improvement and if anything the current situation will be worse. This is totally unacceptable and proves that the whole project is a complete White Elephant. Indeed it is stated in the EIS that the only way to mitigate for this situation by 2033 is for the working population to adjust their work hours. “Due to forecast congestion, some of this traffic is predicted not to be able to start or finish their journey within the peak period. Some drivers will therefore choose to make their journey either earlier or later in the peak period to avoid delay. This behavior is called ‘peak spreading’...” This is a categorical admission of failure of this complete project and a willful waste of taxpayer money.

In 2033 with the M4 – M5 link the WRTM is forecasting reductions in peak travel times between the M4 corridor and the Sydney Airport/Port Botany area. The times savings that are quoted are miniscule! Between Parramatta and Sydney Airport the time saving is 10 minutes. Between Burwood and Sydney Airport the time saving is 5 minutes. Between Silverwater and Port Botany the time saving is 10 minutes. So for well over $20Billion all that can be saved is just a handful of minutes! This total waste of public money is completely unacceptable.

These points beg the question as to the value of Stage 3 as it will increase traffic congestion in some areas and knowing this has no plans to address this. This is totally unacceptable as a proposal stated to be about improving traffic in the city. Taking into account that the “success” of the M4/M5 link (according to the EIS) depends on building a further three extensive road networks, not yet planned let alone approved, this seriously raises the question as to the purpose of WestConnex and in particular Stage 3. Even according to its own EIS, Westconnex will not work. These kinds of statements in its own EIS make it abundantly clear that Westconnex is not about improving our city but directing taxpayer money to private profit. Any serious plan to address transport infrastructure in Sydney would at the very least seriously consider public transport alongside roadways. The fact that this proposal will result in increased traffic congestion in an area that is to be substantially and extremely negatively impacted by Stage 3 over a number of years of construction; and finally, will result in very small, if any, improvements in traffic flow in the long run, strongly indicate that the government needs to go back to the drawing board for a proper and transparent overhaul Sydney’s failing road systems.

Cris-crossing tunnels under homes According to the ‘concept design’, the tunnels under Rozelle/Lilyfield are going to be on three levels. SMC engineers have told residents that the top one of these will only be 15 metres from the surface. The EIS does not explain how such an exchange would be built. It does not explain what safety procedures would be undertaken to deal with situations like serious congestion, accidents or fire if it should be built. With a serious traffic hold-up in the deepest of these tunnels, the air quality will very quickly become toxic unless substantial air conditioning is a major part of the design. No adequate explanation of the plans to manage pollution in these tunnels is provided.

The EIS states that if congestion proves to be a problem then other solutions will have to be found. Other routes that are being considered will be using the Western Distributor, the Crescent, Victoria Rd, Ross St, Pyrmont Bridge Rd and Johnston St. The Crescent and Johnston St are clearly going to be used. This despite the fact that in a consultation, those representing Westconnex assured residents of Annandale that neither Johnston St or Booth St would be used. It is expected that these routes will also be used for night transport. It is clear that it is unlikely that transportation routes shown in the EIS will be adhered to. This is unacceptable.

The mainline tunnel alignment was influenced by a number of factors between Haberfield and St Peters. It is very concerning that one of these factors states that this route was decided on for “Future connections to the motorway network”. This is of particular concern in the light of the Camperdown interchange removal. Westconnex was forced to remove this interchange due to pressure from the RPA Hospital, Sydney University and The Chinese Embassy. Knowing that the Camperdown Interchange was originally part of the plan, it is highly concerning to see this reference to future motorway connections but no disclosures outlining where these connections could be. The EIS also states that in 2016 extending a tunnel link to the South side of the Gladesville Bridge was seriously considered rather than to the Iron Cove Bridge but this was shelved due to costs. In light of the way residents and homeowners have been dealt with by Westconnex, the consideration of other areas for add
The tunnels under Rozelle/Lilyfield are going to be in three levels. Leaving aside the question of the unexplained complex engineering involved in such a design, the EIS does not explain what safety procedures are being built into the project. How are situations such as heavy traffic congestion, accidents or fire to be dealt with. As stated above a serious traffic hold-up on the deepest of these tunnels would seriously impact air quality that could put the lives of people in the tunnels at risk. There is no in-depth detail about how these issues are going to be addressed in terms of both above ground and below ground risks. Again this is irresponsible and unacceptable.

Air Pollution 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 in this area. Tunnel Portals are known areas of high levels of pollution. It is unacceptable to build these tunnels in densely populated areas, and 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.”

Recently built tunnels in Tokyo successfully filter 98% of all pollutants. Given the technology is easily available It is totally unacceptable that the tunnels will not be filtered.

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. Heart disease will skyrocket due to air pollution caused by Westconnex bringing more cars into the Inner West says Paul Torzillo, Head of Respiratory medicine at Royal Prince Albert Hospital. (Inner West Courier 23rd May 2017) 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. 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 does not work if the tunnels go around corners, which is the case with the tunnels from the Rozelle Rail Yards site.

The three Pollution Stacks in the Rozelle Rail Yards are shown to be 38 metres 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 metres above sea level. Balmain Road between Wharf Rd and Victoria Road is at an elevation of 37 metres on average. Orange Grove Primary School is at an elevation of 3.4 metres. Areas of Hornsey Rd Rozelle are at 28 metres. Around the junction of Annandale St and Weynton St in Annandale the height above sea level is 29 metres. All these areas are in close proximity to these stacks. All the pollution being exhausted from these stacks will be entering the atmosphere at around the same level as housing and schools and local services and will be dispersing 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 areas highly polluted. This is not acceptable. There are at least four schools of Primary age children well within one kilometre of these Stacks. Young children are the most vulnerable to pollution related disease. Given this, this is an unacceptable risk and the proposal should not be approved.

The Rozelle Rail Yards site is a totally inappropriate area to create new recreational grounds as the area will be highly polluted as a result of the surrounding unfiltered Pollution Stacks and Tunnel Portals. In the EIS it is referred to as an ideal 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 irresponsible and beyond belief. It demonstrates that those who have put these plans together are either staggeringly ignorant or disdainful of the impacts of these proposals on the local communities. At a time when major cities around the world are doing all they can to address the dire problems of environmental pollution, including removing major roadways and investing in public transport, this is an appalling suggestion that reflects a planning process that is at best out of touch and at worst deliberately misleading and disdainful.

Subsidence Land Subsidence in the areas of all tunnel routes is of great concern to all residents. This is of especial concern in the Rozelle/Lilyfield area where layers of tunnels are planned. There is likely to be ongoing and considerable subsidence even when the tunnels are built due to the ongoing necessity to remove groundwater from the tunnels. This will lead to a slow drying out of the sandstone and hence settlement.

Generally the risk of settlement is lessened where tunnelling is deeper 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 deep. This is of major concern. In the ongoing construction of Stages 1 and 2 vibration and tunneling activities have led to numbers of people experiencing extensive damage to their homes costing thousands of dollars to rectify. These people have followed all the correct procedures but as yet their claims have not been settled. This is totally unacceptable. The tunnelling proposals in relation to the Rozelle area are very likely to lead to the same problems and yet there is nothing addressing these major concerns in the EIS.

Removal of Community Parkland One of the main reasons for establishing Buruwan Park was to provide 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. 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 this suburb has fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies along 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 encourage 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.

Tunnelling and Heritage There has been no evaluation of the potential impacts of tunnelling on hundreds of old buildings including valuable and treasured heritage ones. The documentation of the heritage in Newtown is inadequate. The promise that repairs would be done if damage occurs during tunnelling is insufficient. Home owners in Beverly Hills who have experienced major damage from the St Georges Rd interchange works have been denied compensation by both RMS and the contractor Fulton Hogan.

No Consultation Residents in the eastern part of Newtown were not notified of the SMC’s intention to tunnel under Newtown School and surrounding buildings during the concept design phase. To this day they have never been notified that they could be impacted by WestConnex Stage 3. This is a failure of ‘meaningful consultation’ which is a requirements of the SEARS for this EIS.

Clearways in King Street The NSW Planning assessment decision for the New M5 stated that the NSW government was committed to having no clearways on King Street, other than the current weekday peak hour ones. Shortly after this EIS was released, the RMS announced that they would be moving towards clearways in King Street, Newtown during the weekend. This countermanded a promise made by the ex- Minister for Roads Duncan Gay in 2015 and the commitment to in the earlier New M5 EIS decision.

Residents and business owners know that clearways would kill King Street. After the community expressed its anger, the Minister for Roads Melinda Pavey and the Shadow Minister for Infrastructure Anthony Albanese announced that there would be no clearways. These political shifts would seem to be more designed to assuage public opinion rather than to present an honest assessment of what the impact of increased traffic flowing from the St Peters Interchange will be on King Street and on surrounding roads. Unless WestConnex including Stage 3 is stopped, the thriving
precinct of King Street Newtown will be vulnerable to clearways. We need transport policy that reduces traffic congestion not encourages it.

Health Risks It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With the massive number of extra truck movements, 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."

Tolls The section on tolls in the Social and economic Assessment Technical Working paper is remarkably brief given their impact on the drivers of Sydney will last for 43 years.

It is outrageous to quote in support of tolls studies paid for by a tollway owner – Transurban. No one would be surprised to find the studies assert: “NSW’s toll roads have directly contributed $14 billion in economic, social and environmental benefits over 10 years”. (Road tolling. 8.6.3 p.162).

The accounting firms, Ernst and Young and KPMG, are not independent sources. There are no details of how their studies arrived at the findings so it is not possible make an independent assessment of them. We are left guessing what is considered a social or environmental benefit. Citing studies paid for by a tollway owner undermines the credibility to the EIS’s discussion of tolls.

The proposed distance-based tolls will increase by 4% a year or by the CPI, whichever is higher. No justification for the increases is provided. The EIS discussion has to admit that the tolls are inequitable. The people of Western Sydney tend to have lower household incomes than the inner and northern suburbs so a distance-based toll is a double burden. When wages are falling even below a low inflation rate, to impose increases well above the inflation rate is an unfair burden on road users without adequate public transport alternatives.

The EIS reports that people on lower average incomes driving to work find the burden of daily tolls a significant financial cost and therefore they prefer to drive longer distances to avoid paying tolls. The shift of traffic onto Parramatta Rd when the toll on the widened M4 was re-imposed is evidence of drivers already avoiding the tolls.

Tolls are supposed to lead to “alterations to … reduced or redirected emissions, reduced traffic accidents, vehicle operation cost savings” but there is no evidence provided of how these effects are achieved. While the new roads are tolled and the old routes remain free, there is every incentive for drivers to use the old routes and save their money. In an era of stagnant wages and precarious employment saving money is likely to be a more significant motive than this discussion recognises. This effect is evidently not taken into account when assessing the impact of the overall project in operation on driving patterns because the EIS predicts “no major shifts in daily forecast traffic onto alternative, parallel routes” (Appendix H Technical Working Paper, Traffic and transport). This is not credible.

The section refers to finding community concern in a consultation, but this is dismissed with this assertion: “Although road tolling would be a cost to individuals, the benefits of tolling to the broader economy is (sic) a greater socio-economic consequence. Effects would be long-term and benefit the Greater Sydney Region.” (Appendix H, p.163.)

In other words the people on lower incomes in western Sydney with fewer public transport alternatives than further east are being asked to pay more for driving, to reduce congestion on roads for the benefit of greater Sydney! Since all the benefits of the WestConnex project the EIS states are linked to other projects to come – the western harbour tunnel or the Sydney gateway – it is not clear that Western Sydney commuters will ever get any direct benefit for paying ever increasing tolls for 40+ years. I object to the tolls, with their built-in increase of 4% a year, which seem imposed principally to make the project saleable to a private corporation, like Transurban.

For all these reasons strongly object to Stage 3. 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.
Yours sincerely,

This email was sent by 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 provided an email address which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to

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 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 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 22 metres, Hill St at 28 metres, Moore St 27 metres, Piper St 37 metres (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2), Catherine St at 28 metres (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.

- Rather than ease congestion the project is likely to reduce the availability of funds for projects that enable that genuinely reduce congestion (road pricing), give priority for high productivity road users such as delivery and service vehicles or genuinely avoid congestion (public transport in separate corridors/lanes).

- The EIS projects increases in freight volumes without offering evidence as to how the project enables this. Assertions relating to improvements for freight services rely on the Sydney Gateway Project, which is not part of WestConnex, and which poses significant threats to the crucial freight rail connection to Port Botany. Port Botany itself has questioned whether the current project provides any benefit to it.

- The most highly effected area of Stage 3 will be Rozelle with the massive and complex interchange. Nothing like this has been built anywhere else in the World and it is highly questionable as to whether it can be built at all in the form outlined in the EIS. The EIS does not show any detailed plans as to how this will be achieved. There are no constructional details at all, what is shown is a concept only, this is totally unacceptable.

- There is relatively limited urban redevelopment potential along the small section of Victoria Road that the Project would decongest, and this section is not been classified by the NSW Government as redevelopment area. To claim this as a benefit is misleading.

- Easton Park has a long history and is part of an urban environment which is unusual in Sydney. The park needs to be assessed from a visual design point of view. It will be quite a different park when its view is changed to one of a large ventilation stack. The suggestion that it has been ‘saved’ needs to be considered in the light of the severe 5 years construction impacts and the reshaped urban environment.

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 for the following reasons:

- 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.

- 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 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 treat 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: ____________________________
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.

- We 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.

- Weichhardt 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 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 3-4 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. 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 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.
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.

- 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 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.

- The EIS states that Darley Road is a contaminated site, likely including asbestos. 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.

- 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 pedestrians.
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 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 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.

- 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.

- 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 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 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 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 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.

b) 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 were 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.

c) 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."

d) 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.
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.

- 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.
- The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors.
- The business case for the project in all three stages has failed to account for 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.
- 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 7-41 acknowledges that there is great concern in the community that King Street, Newtown, will be made a 24 hour clearway, stating “Roads and Maritime has no plan to change the existing clearways on King Street”. This statement is deliberately misleading - it infers that SMC has authority in controlling impacts on regional roads. Roads and Maritime have the unfettered right to declare Clearways wherever and whenever they wish, and RMS has NEVER stated publicly that King Street will not be subject to extended clearways.
- 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?
- There are estimated 100 heavy and 70 light vehicle movements a day and the plan is to allow a right-hand turn into Darley Road from the CW Link. The trucks will drive onto Darley Road, turn right into the site and then left back out onto the CW Link, which is unrealistic given the amount of traffic on these roads now.
- 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.
- 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?
- 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).
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- It is stated that if congestion proves to be a problem then other solutions will have to be found. Other routes that are being considered will be using the Western Distributor, the Crescent, Victoria Rd, Ross St, Pyrmont Bridge Rd and Johnston St. The Crescent and Johnston St are clearly going to be used. This despite the fact that in a consultation those representing Westconnext assured residents of Annandale that neither Johnston St or Booth St would be used. It is expected that these routes will also be used for night transport. It is clear that it is unlikely that transportation routes shown in the EIS will be adhered to. This is unacceptable.

- 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.

- The widening of the Crescent between the City West link and Johnston St with an extra lane being constructed will lead to heavy traffic congestion. This will be exacerbated still further by extra traffic light control cycles being incorporated into the signaling at both Johnston St and at the City West Link, with the inclusion of an extra traffic light control 400m West from the Crescent / City West Link junction to manage the movement of large numbers of spoil trucks.

- 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.”

- 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.

- Additional facilities. The EIS states that the contractor may decide upon additional ‘construction ancillary facilities’ to the 12 identified in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be more unidentified sites taken, as residents will have no opportunity to comment on their impacts. The approval condition should limit any construction facilities to those already notified and detailed in the EIS.
I object to the WestConnex M4-MS Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Hammay Gatling

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: 65 Liberty St

Suburb: Enmore

1. 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.

2. 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)

3. All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street) should have a blanket 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. These streets are not constructed for heavy vehicle movements and on this basis should also be ruled out. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements including parking and worker parking on all of these streets.

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. 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.

6. The EIS does not mention the impact of aircraft noise and its cumulative impact. As such, the noise levels identified are misleading. I object to the selection of the Darley Road site because of the unacceptable noise impacts it will have on surrounding homes 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.

A. 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.

B. It is clear from the EIS that spoil truck movements will not be confined to the City West link. At a community consultation it was revealed that trucks removing spoil at Camperdown would very likely be travelling from the James Craig Rd area and in that case would be using the additional lane on the Crescent and then turning right up Johnston St. This is totally CONTRARY to what concerned residents had been promised would not happen. It is clear that any assurances given to the community in past consultations are totally disregarded without consultation later. This is unacceptable.

C. Heart disease will skyrocket due to air pollution caused by Westconnex bringing more cars into the Inner West says Paul Torzillo, Head of Respiratory medicine at Royal Prince Albert Hospital. Inner West Courier 23rd May 2017

D. 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: 817 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.

E. 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.

F. 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.

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.
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. 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.

b. 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.

c. The mainline tunnel alignment was influenced by a number of factors between Haberfield and St Peters. It is very concerning that one of these factors, states that this route was decided on for: “Future connections to the motorway network”. This is of particular concern in the light of the Camperdown interchange removal. Westconnex was forced to remove this interchange due to pressure from the RPA Hospital, Sydney University and The Chinese Embassy. Knowing that the Camperdown Interchange was wanted it is highly concerning to see this reference to future motorway connections but no disclosures outlining where these connections maybe. The EIS also states that in 2016 extending a tunnel link to the South side of the Gladesville Bridge was seriously considered rather than to the Iron Cove Bridge but this was shelved due to costs. In light of the way residents and home owners have been dealt with by Westconnex the fact that other areas are being considered for add on sectors to this project is of great concern.

d. 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.

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.
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. The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed. 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 in project delivery. The approval conditions need to contain detail of specific noise mitigation measures that are mandated and can be enforced.

II. 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.

III. 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.

IV. 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.' 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.

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 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 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.

b) 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 were 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.

c) 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."

d) 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.
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.
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 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.

- The mainline tunnel alignment was influenced by a number of factors between Haberfield and St Peters. It is very concerning that one of these factors, states that this route was decided on for: "Future connections to the motorway network". This is of particular concern in the light of the Camperdown interchange removal. Westconnex was forced to remove this interchange due to pressure from the RPA Hospital, Sydney University and The Chinese Embassy. Knowing that the Camperdown Interchange was wanted is highly concerning to see this reference to future motorway connections but no disclosures outlining where these connections maybe. The EIS also states that in 2016 extending a tunnel link to the South side of the Gladesville Bridge was seriously considered rather than to the Iron Cove Bridge but this was shelved due to costs. In light of the way residents and home owners have been dealt with by Westconnex the fact that other areas are being considered for add on sectors to this project is of great concern.

- 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.

- In 2033 with the M4 - M5 link the WRTM is forecasting reductions in peak travel times between the M4 corridor and the Sydney Airport/Port Botany area. The times savings that are quoted miniscule! Between Parramatta and Sydney Airport the time saving is 10 minutes. Between Burwood and Sydney Airport the time saving is 5 minutes. Between Silverwater and Port Botany the time saving is 10 minutes. So for well over $20Billion all that can be saved is just a handful of minutes! This total waste of public money is completely unacceptable.
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 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. 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 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 ____________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

1. **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.

2. **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?

3. **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.

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 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.**

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

Name: Clare Leehridge
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: 1 Claremont St
Suburb: Balmain
Postcode: 2041

• 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.
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 EIS acknowledges that impacts of construction should M4/M5 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.
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 statements.

- 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.
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 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. It 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.
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.

1. 11599 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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 ___________________________
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.

1. 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 of 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 statements.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

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. 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.

7. 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.

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 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 refers to construction impacts as being ‘temporary’. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle.

- 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.

- 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.

---

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


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 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.
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.

1. It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle.

2. 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 groundwater 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.

3. 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.

4. The EIS refers to construction impacts as being ‘temporary’. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

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. 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.

7. 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.

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 __________________________

Name: Mayanne Lid
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:

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.
| **Attention Director**  
| **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,**  
| **Department of Planning and Environment**  
| **Application Number: SSI 7485**  
| **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**  
| **From:**  
| **Name:** Marianne LIA  
| **Address:** 12 Susan St  
| **Application Name:** Westconnex M4-M5 Link  
| **Suburb:** Newtown  
| **Postcode:** 2042  

### Declaration
- I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

---

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.

---

I would like to assist and/or keep up to date with the anti-Westconnex campaign - These details will be removed before lodging this submission, and will be used only for campaign purposes and will not be divulged to other parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attention: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 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:

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 ___________________________
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:

- 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 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 millimeters 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.

- 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 EIS refers to construction impacts as being ‘temporary’. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

- It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle

- 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.

- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 '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 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.**

- **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.**

- **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 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 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.**

---

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

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 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.

- 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 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.

- The EIS is misleading because it discusses the creation of 14,350 direct jobs during construction. It omits the fact that jobs have also been lost because of acquisition of businesses, many of which were long-standing and employed hundreds of workers. (Executive Summary xviii)

- 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.

- 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.

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 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.

streets leading to and around the Inner West Interchange are astonishingly low, eg John St at 22m, Emma St at 24m, Hill St at 28m, Moore St 27m, Piper St 37m, (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2), Catherine St at 28m (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1) - homes would indisputably sustain damage or cracking at these depths.

- 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

- Concentrations of some pollutants PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ are already near the current standard and in excess of proposed standards (p9-81, p9-93). It is critical to note that these particulates are a classified carcinogen and are known to have critical, and at times fatal, consequences if elevated. People living within 500 metres of heavily affected areas have demonstrably shorter lives, much higher incidences of chronic lung conditions and higher levels of cardiovascular diseases.

- I object to the whole WestConnex project and Stage 3, the M4-M5 Link in particular, because I object to paying high tolls to fund a road project that does not benefit Western Sydney.

- The EIS notes that an 'Operational Traffic Performance Review' will be undertaken at 12 months and five years after the M4-M5 Link is open to consider the need for "post-opening mitigation measures" (Page 223, Chapter 9.8, Appendix H). I object to this approach as it is contrary to the requirements of the EIS process and reflects a clear admission on the part of the NSW Government that:
  - It has no confidence in the traffic modelling process to predict to any reliable extent the likely impacts of the Project;
  - It is unable or unprepared to describe the true impacts of the Project on the people of NSW;
  - It has not considered or budgeted for the potentially significant additional roadworks required to address the impacts of the Project (or the need for road upgrades to feed toll-paying drivers to WestConnex.

- The modelling conclusions are internally inconsistent. There is an assumption that traffic would dissipate at the edge of the motorway with no negative impacts on the CBD, Mascot and Alexandria. However there is also an assumption that additional roads would be needed to cope with said traffic.

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: Steff Leedham

Signature: Steff Leedham

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: 5/10 Geow St, Balmain

Postcode: 2041

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 Weyton St in Annandale the height above sea level is 24 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.

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 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 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.

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
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.

1. The key intersection performance tables in App H (p.258 St Peters and 248 Rozelle) demonstrate that many intersections will either worsen (at the worst case scenario of LOS F) or remain unchanged particularly in 2033, including the following intersections:
   - Princes Highway/Canal Road
   - Princes Highway/Railway Road
   - Unwins Bridge Road/Campbell Street
   - Campbell Road/Bourke Road
   - Princes Highway/Campbell Street
   - Ricketty Street/Kent Road
   - Gardeners Road/Kent Road
   - Gardeners Road/Bourke Road
   - Gardeners Rd/O'Riordan Street
   - Victoria Road/Lyons Road
   - Victoria Road/Darling Street
   - Victoria Road/Robert Street

2. I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.

3. The proponent excludes the impact of the Western Sydney Airport from analysis of the project. This could have a significant impact on traffic volumes.

4. The modelling shows significant increases in traffic on Victoria Rd (+20% ADT) which is already at capacity.

5. Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

6. Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

7. The modelling shows the motorway exceeds reasonable operating limits in the peak in less than ten years.

8. The underlying traffic modelling and outputs was insufficient to:
   - Demonstrate the need for the project.
   - Understand impacts of dispersed traffic on connecting roads, such as the Anzac Bridge, and whether they have available capacity to meet the predicted traffic discharge. Any congestion on exits has the capacity to negate all travel time savings to the exit point, given the small predicted benefits.

9. Public transport is rejected by the EIS so the state government is forcing us to use cars more when most major cities in the world are trying to reduce the number of cars on the roads. We know this is to promote private road operators' profits. I object to putting so much public funding to the cause of private profit. I urge the Secretary of Planning to reject this project.
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: Steffi Leedham

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: 5/10 Gow St

Suburb: Balmain 2041

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 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.

The proposed Inner West Subsurface Interchange, planned as part of Stage 1 (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1), linking the 2 mainline tunnels with the Rozelle Interchange and the Iron Cove link is of serious concern, there has been little information about the Inner West Interchange, its construction or exactly which streets it would affect. At Westconnex Information sessions held in the inner west in Sept 2017 staff state the path of the tunnels and the Interchange are ‘indicative only’. How are residents expected to submit submissions without knowing if their street is affected?

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

The project would take land intended for housing and employment specified in The Bays Precinct Transformation Plan.

Significantly, there is nothing in the EIS to ensure that tunnelling would be at a sufficient depth so as not to endanger the integrity of homes, including vibration, and noise impacts. Further, without provision for full compensation for damage sustained there would be no incentive for contractors, or Roads and Maritime Services, to minimise damage to homes or indeed to have any concern for damage sustained.

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.

Given that these works could be undertaken to deliver toll paying drivers to the privately owned WestConnex, there is strong potential for a conflict between private profit and community impacts. The cost of any such integration works should very clearly be attributed to the Project cost, and should not impact on the available RMS budget for the State road network normal maintenance and improvement budget.

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: Stephanie Leedhaune

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: 5710 Colo St

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

Attention: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Suburb: Balmain NSW Postcode: 2041

The EIS notes that the Project would cause additional traffic congestion on a number of key roads including: Gardeners Road and Bourke Road in the south, Frederick Street (Ashfield), Johnston Street (Annandale) and numerous streets in Mascot (p.8-103). The EIS must assess and identify any upgrades that the Project will require.

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.

The proponent does not consider the impact of the Sydney Metro West. This project will have a significant impact on travel behaviour (and specifically mode share).

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 modelling shows severe traffic levels and increased congestion on Johnston St, and The Crescent (+80% ADT).

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.

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)

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

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.

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 assuming journey time shifting when mode shifting is more likely.

The modelling does not consider the latest plans from the NSW Government's Greater Sydney Commission despite them being released nine months ago.

I object to the whole project because the people of Western Sydney were not consulted about where they wanted new roads or what transport they prefer. The WestConnex project with the tolls we will have to pay was just dumped on us, there was no consultation about our needs.

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.

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)

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: ____________________________
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 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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: ____________________
Attention Director
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Name: Steffi Leadman
Address: 5/10 GoW St

Application Number: SSI 7485
Suburb: Balmain
Postcode: 2041

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 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 significance 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.

- 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 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.

- 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.

- It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle.

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:.................................................. Steff Leadbeath
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:.............................................. 51/10 Goulburn St
Suburb:................................................ Balmain
Postcode.............. 2041

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.

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 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.

Whilst chapters 10 and 12 of Appendix H show mid-block level of service at interfaces with interchanges and points within the tunnels, there is no information about other mid-block points such as the ANZAC Bridge. Part 8.3.3 of the EIS refers to increases in daily traffic forecasts on the Anzac Bridge/Western Distributor, particularly in the AM peak, as traffic accesses the M4-M5 Link and future forms of traffic or network management are intended. Information about the traffic forecasts for the Anzac Bridge/Western Distributor should be provided.

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?

I object to the way this project is hailed by the Minister for Western Sydney Stuart Ayres for the benefit of western Sydney when hardly any parts of Sydney west of Parramatta are even mentioned in the EIS. This is deliberately misleading. All the reasons for this stage of WestConnex are about linking the new M4 and M5 to the western harbour tunnel and northern beaches tunnel. Or they talk about links to the “Sydney Gateway” to the airport and Port Botany and they are not even part of this project.

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 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: Steffi Leedham

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: 510 Gowan St, Balmain

Postcode: 2041

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 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 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.

➢ 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.

➢ 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.

➢ 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.

➢ 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.

➢ I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.

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: Emily Matthews
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: 14 Eton St
Suburb: Camperdown
Postcode: 2050

⇒ 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.

⇒ 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 overnight 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 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!

⇒ The EIS refers to construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

⇒ 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.

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: Au Eaton
Signature: Au Eaton

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: 172  CHURCH ST
Suburb: NENTOWN Postcode 2042

A. 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.

B. 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.

C. 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.

D. 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.

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

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: 344 Gt Postcode & Val

Submission to:
Planning Services,
Département 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

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.

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 statements.

All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to falls Street) should have a blanket 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. These streets are not constructed for heavy vehicle movements and on this basis should also be ruled out. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements including parking) and worker parking on all of these streets.

The social and economic impact study fails to record the great concern for valued Newtown heritage.

I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.

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.

Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates an 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.
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 M$/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.
I object to the WestConnex M4-MS Link proposals as contained in the EIS application SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: [signature]

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: [address]

Application Name: WestConnex M4-MS Link

Suburb: [suburb], Postcode [postcode]

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 or whether 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 __________________________
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. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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).
8. 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.
9. I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.
10. 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.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. Why is there no detailed information about the so called ‘King Street Gateway’ included in the EIS ?

9. I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

10. 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.

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

Name: Debbie Duncan

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: Yassie Ave

Suburb: Haberfield

Postcode: 2045

A. 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.

B. 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.

C. 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.

D. 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.

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

Name: .................................................................

Signature: ...........................................................

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

Address: .............................................................

Suburb: ..............................................................

Postcode: .........................................................

A. 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.

B. It is clear from the EIS that spoil truck movements will not be confined to the City West link. At a community consultation it was revealed that trucks removing spoil at Camperdown would very likely be travelling from the James Craig Rd area and in that case would be using the additional lane on the Crescent and then turning right up Johnston St. This is totally CONTRARY to what concerned residents had been promised would not happen. It is clear that any assurances given to the community in past consultations are totally disregarded without consultation later. This is unacceptable.

C. Heart disease will skyrocket due to air pollution caused by Westconnex bringing more cars into the Inner West says Paul Torzillo, Head of Respiratory medicine at Royal Prince Albert Hospital. Inner West Courier 23rd May 2017

D. 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

E. 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.

F. 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.

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 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 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 M$/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.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

⇒ I note that in the area of Lilyfield Rd and Gordon Street, the work proposed which would include deep excavation that would result in major adverse impacts on archaeological remains, while other surface works would have localised impacts on archaeological remains that may be present. It is suggested that what are called ‘management measures’ would be carried out including the development of a Historical Archaeological Research Design which would include an “assessment of any detailed design plans to develop a methodology and scope for a program of test excavation to determine the nature, condition and extent of potential archaeological remains.” This is completely unacceptable to me. The community will have no right to any input into this plan or access to independent expert advice. This is all part of an ‘approve now, research later’ approach that will lead to poorly planned unnecessary destruction, a loss of potential community history and understanding.

⇒ It is quite clear to me that insufficient research has been done on the archeology of the Rozelle Railway yards. This could be a valuable archeology site. Why has an EIS been put forward without the necessary research being done to further identify potential remains? No project should be approved on the basis of such an inadequate level of research.

⇒ 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.

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

I

Name: James Mooney

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: 33 Chester St

Suburb: Petersham

I. 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.

II. 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.

III. I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.

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

1. 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)

2. 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?

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. The widening of the Crescent between the City West link and Johnston St with an extra lane being constructed will lead to heavy traffic congestion. This will be exacerbated still further by extra traffic light control cycles being incorporated into the signaling at both Johnston St and at the City West Link, with the inclusion of an extra traffic light control 400m West from the Crescent / City West Link junction to manage the movement of large numbers of spoil trucks.

8. 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.”
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: ROBIN WICKS

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: 19/36 Livingstone Rd

Suburb: Ashbury

Postcode: 2040

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 EIS states that the Rozelle interchange and the surrounds of the Anzac Bridge are currently close to capacity. With the proposed project construction the area is going to be subjected to a huge increase in vehicle movements throughout the area for 5 years. Even the ‘with project’ scenario states that this area will experience no improvement and if anything the current situation will be worse. This is totally unacceptable and proves that the whole project is a complete White Elephant. Indeed it is stated in the EIS that the only way to mitigate for this situation by 2033 is for the working population to adjust their work hours. “Due to forecast congestion, some of this traffic is predicted not to be able to start or finish their journey within the peak period. Some drivers will therefore choose to make their journey either earlier or later in the peak period to avoid delay. This behavior is called ‘peak spreading’…” This is a categorical admission of failure of this complete project and a stupendous waste of Tax Payers money.

B. No need for ‘dive site’ – Leichhardt. There is no need for the Darley Road site, other than a time saving (tunneling) of several months. It is unacceptable that the community should be forced to endure 5 years of severe disruption to accommodate the timetable of the private contractors. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it contains provision for the Darley Road site without any proper justification as for its need.

C. 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.

D. The EIS is misleading because it discusses the creation of 14,350 direct jobs during construction. It omits the fact that jobs have also been lost because of acquisition of businesses, many of which were long-standing and employed hundreds of workers. (Executive Summary xviii)

E. 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.

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.

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 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 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.

◊ 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.

◊ In 2033 with the M4 - M5 link the WRTM is forecasting reductions in peak travel times between the M4 corridor and the Sydney Airport/Port Botany area. The times savings that are quoted miniscule! Between Parramatta and Sydney Airport the time saving is 10 minutes. Between Burwood and Sydney Airport the time saving is 5 minutes. Between Silverwater and Port Botany the time saving is 10 minutes. So for well over $20Billion all that can be saved is just a handful of minutes! This total waste of public money is completely unacceptable.

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: [Name]
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: [Address]
Suburb: [Suburb]
Postcode: [Postcode]

1. 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.

2. 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)

3. All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to falls Street) should have a blanket prohibition on any truck movements and worker contractor parking. These hoems 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. These streets are not constructed for heavy vehicle movements and on this basis should also be ruled out. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements including parking and worker parking on all of these streets.

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. 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.

6. The EIS does not mention the impact of aircraft noise and its cumulative impact. As such, the noise levels identified are misleading. I object to the selection of the Darley Road site because of the unacceptable noise impacts it will have on surrounding homes 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: [Name] Email: [Email] Mobile: [Mobile]
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.

- Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces provided for site workers (EIS). The daily workforce for these sites is shown to be approximately 550. This means that 150 vehicles will need to park in nearby local streets which are already at full capacity during weekdays from commuters parking and taking the light rail.

- The EIS asserts that WestConnex will be a catalyst for urban renewal along major corridors. No evidence is provided to back this assertion. The Sydney experience suggests that roads don't - this is not a likely catalyst e.g. Canterbury Road after M5 East; Cumberland Highway corridor after the M7.

- 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 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.

- 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.

- Heart disease will skyrocket due to air pollution caused by Westconnex bringing more cars into the Inner West says Paul Torzillo, Head of Respiratory medicine at Royal Prince Albert Hospital. Inner West Courier 23rd May 2017

- The newly formed Greater Sydney Commission is currently preparing strategic plans (six District Plans and the Greater Sydney Region Plan) for Sydney's long-term future and TfNSW is currently developing Sydney's Transport Future. All motorway projects should be placed on hold until finalisation of these plans.

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

a. 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.

b. 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.

c. The mainline tunnel alignment was influenced by a number of factors between Haberfield and St Peters. It is very concerning that one of these factors, states that this route was decided on for: “Future connections to the motorway network”. This is of particular concern in the light of the Camperdown interchange removal. Westconnex was forced to remove this interchange due to pressure from the RPA Hospital, Sydney University and The Chinese Embassy. Knowing that the Camperdown Interchange was wanted it is highly concerning to see this reference to future motorway connections but no disclosures outlining where these connections maybe. The EIS also states that in 2016 extending a tunnel link to the South side of the Gladesville Bridge was seriously considered rather than to the Iron Cove Bridge but this was shelved due to costs. In light of the way residents and home owners have been dealt with by Westconnex the fact that other areas are being considered for add on sectors to this project is of great concern.

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

- I specifically object to the removal of the lighting tower and the Port Authority Building. These items are of considerable local significance and are representative of the operation of the Rozelle Rail Yards in the first part of the 20th century. I do not agree with trashing industrial history when it could be put to good community use.

- Noise impacts – Camperdown The EIS indicates that a large number of residents will be affected by construction noise caused by demolition and pavement and infrastructure works. This includes use of a rock breaker and concrete saw. During all periods of construction, there will be noise impacts from construction of site car parking and deliveries and pavement and infrastructure works. No proper mitigation measures are proposed to protect residents from these impacts (10–118, EIS) The EIS admits that three residents and two businesses will be subject to noise impacts above acceptable levels for 16 days (10–119, EIS) No detail is provided as to whether alternative accommodation will be offered or other compensation.

- Easton Park has a long history and is part of an urban environment which is unusual in Sydney. The park needs to be assessed from a visual design point of view. It will be quite a different park when its view is changed to one of a large ventilation stack. The suggestion that it has been 'saved' needs to be considered in the light of the severe 5 years construction impacts and the reshaped urban environment.

- Cumulative construction impacts – Camperdown. The EIS states that residents will likely be subject to cumulative construction impacts as several tunnelling works activities may operate simultaneously (10–119, EIS) No mitigation steps are proposed to ease this impact on those affected.

- I object to 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.

- Ground-borne out-of-hours work – Camperdown The EIS acknowledges the noise and vibration impacts and the need for work to occur outside of standard daytime construction hours. It simply states that ‘the specific management strategy for addressing potential impacts associated with ground-borne noise...would be documented in the OOHW protocol. This is inadequate as the community have no opportunity to comment on the OOHW protocol or the management of the ongoing impacts to which they will be subjected.

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

Application Number: SSI 7485
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: """"""
Address: 23-19 Mykonos St, H ill Tol d

Suburb: Postcode AST56

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 object to the whole WestConnex project because the state government is forcing us to use cars more when most major cities in the world are trying to reduce the number of cars on the roads. Most world cities are building more public transport including fast trains but our government is building tollways.
- I object to the high tolls and the length of time (43 years) they will be imposed. The only reason is to guarantee income to a private motorway owner-operator. The fact that the toll is based on distance travelled disadvantages people who live on the western side of the Sydney region.
- The EIS admits that the people who live in western Sydney tend to have lower household incomes than in the inner suburbs so 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.
- I object to the whole project because the people of Western Sydney were not consulted about where they wanted new roads or what transport they prefer. The WestConnex project with the tolls we will have to pay was just dumped on us, there was no consultation about our needs.
- I object to the tolls imposed on drivers who have no decent alternative in public transport if they live further west than Parramatta. It is outrageous that the EIS quotes from studies in favour of tollways done by the big accounting firms, KPMG and Ernst and Young, paid for by Transurban, which owns more tollways in Australia than any other corporation. How can this be unbiased?
- Because of the high tolls drivers who have to travel east daily will look for alternative routes and build up the traffic on local roads, both here in western Sydney, on Parramatta Rd and all the way to the city. There is no way the WestConnex roads will reduce traffic on un-tolled roads with tolls on the WestConnex sections so high.
- I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community so there can be an independent assessment. We are expected just to accept all the assertions that the tollways will relieve traffic on other roads, particularly Parramatta Rd.
- The UK and European states are more and more concerned about the bad effects of car emissions on people's health and are taking steps to tougher emission standards. Here the state government is promoting car use at the expense of public health concerns. I object to the WestConnex project because of the increased car emissions it will cause. The adverse health effects of all this traffic are just skipped over in the EIS as "moderate negative" impacts.
- 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. This project should NOT be approved.

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: Bernard Hafey
Signature: 

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

Application Number: SSI 7485
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

a. 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.

b. 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.

c. The construction and operation of the project will result in 51 property acquisitions. We object to the project in its entirety because of this impact. We object to the project in its entirety because of this impact. We note that a number of long-standing businesses have been acquired and that many families and businesses in earlier stages have been forced to go to court to seek fair compensation. We object to the acquisition in particular of the Dan Murphys site. The business was substantially renovated and a new business opened with full knowledge of the likely acquisition. We object to it being acquired and compensated in this circumstances and call on the Government to investigate the circumstances which led to this occurring (Executive Summary xvii)

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. 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.

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 __________________