


**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: Fiona Henderson

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: 138 Probert St

Suburb: Newtown NSW Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- a. 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.
- b. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur. It states that subsidence may occur along tunnel paths due to tunnel excavation and water drawdown. The risk of ground movement and subsidence is greater where tunnels are less than 35 metres underground. The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels in that area which are a great deal less than 35metres. The same is true for areas of Rozelle where layers of tunnels are proposed. This will definitely lead to structural damage and cracking to homes above. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage. This is not acceptable
- c. The proposed work hours for the Rozelle Rail Yards Site are tunnelling and spoil handling 24 hours a day seven days a week. On ground construction Mon-Fri 7.00am - 6.00pm, Sat 8.00am-1.00pm. 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 schedules have fallen behind and this has lead to great physical and mental stress for many residents through interrupted sleep and loss of sleep especially for those 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 addressed in the EIS.
- d. 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.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: Fiona Henderson

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: 138 Probert St

Suburb: Newtown

Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport  
Assessments


Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:  
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- 1) 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.
- 2) 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
- 3) There is no evidence of scenario modelling being used to allow testing the ability of different packages of integrated transport measures to achieve outcomes. The Long Term Transport Masterplan states that integrated approaches are required to manage congestion. The NSW Minister for Transport claims that we "have to get more people on public transport."
- 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 - 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 clearway.
- 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) The proposed work hours for the Rozelle Rail Yards are tunnelling and spoil handling 24 hours a day seven days a week. Civil construction Mon - Fri 7.00am – 6.00pm, Sat 8.00am -1.00 pm. There will be no night work at The Crescent Civil Site and the daytime hours are stated to be the same as at the Rozelle Rail Yards. However as has been experienced by those at Haberfield and St Peters these hours and especially late and night work have been extended and implemented when the schedule has fallen behind and this has lead to physical and mental stress for many residents through interrupted sleep and loss of sleep especially with children. The roads and sites at night in the area will see a marked increase in noise from truck movements, truck reversing alarms and running machinery. It will also see a marked increase in light during the night hours with site illumination and vehicle head lights as has been experienced in other areas. These problems have not been properly addressed and are not adequately dealt with in the EIS.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_


Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Tiana Henderson</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: 	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>138 Probert St</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Newtown</u> Postcode: <u>NSW</u>	

**I submit my objection** to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

- a. *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.*
- b. *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.*
- c. *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.*
- 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.*

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Fiona Henderson</u>	
	Address: <u>138 Probert St</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Newtown</u>	Postcode <u>2042</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

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

Botany. Port Botany itself has questioned whether the current project provides any benefit to it.

- I. The WestConnex program of works has been described as an integrated transport network solution. However, the role and interdependency with public transport and freight rail is not considered. The recent Government commitment to a Metro West requires a rethink on the need for WestConnex. Particularly as the WestConnex business case outlines a mode shift from public transport to the toll road as a benefit required to justify it economically.
- II. While WestConnex might integrate with the wider motorway network, no evidence is provided demonstrating that it integrates with the wider road network – let alone the broader transport and land use system. For example the EIS provides no information about changes in traffic volumes entering the Sydney CBD caused by WestConnex. RMS has only just commenced work to identify which roads fanning out from WestConnex portals will need to be upgraded to deliver large numbers of vehicles to and from the project. It is therefore possible to form a properly informed understanding of the environmental impacts – the very purpose of the EIS.
- III. The EIS states that the project will improve connection to the Sydney Airport and Port Botany.

It will not. The Premier herself has said that the Sydney Gateway does not form part of the WestConnex project. Without the Sydney Gateway, connections between WestConnex (St Peters Interchange) and Sydney Airport and Port Botany will be via congested surface roads in Botany and Mascot. As the connection is unresolved, it is impossible to determine the effect on demand of the unknown pricing regime that will apply to the Sydney Gateway, nor how much travel time will be incurred – which might actually negate the already marginal proposed travel time savings.

- IV. 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.
- V. Ambient air quality - 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

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: Nisha Hewitt

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: 12, 2470 Burwood road

Suburb: Concord Postcode: 2134

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

- ◇ 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.
- ◇ 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 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.
- ◇ 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.
- ◇ 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)
- ◇ 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)
- ◇ 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: Oran G

Signature: AMH

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 Richmond St

Suburb: Canilla Postcode: 2240

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- ✦ Increased traffic congestion in areas around portals will increase pollution along roadsides, 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 enables them to be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.
- ✦ 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 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
- ✦ 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 clearway.
- ✦ 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.
- ✦ 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.
- ✦ 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.

**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 WESTHEAD

Signature: K Westhead

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: 156 Rochford St, E

Suburb: Erskineville

Postcode: 2043

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director  
Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name:  
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: CHANTAL LAWRENCE

Signature: 

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

Address: 6 SMITH LANE

Suburb: ELKINERVILLE Postcode

2043

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

- a) 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
- b) 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.
- c) The modelling area shown in Figure 8-5 should be extended to include Johnston Street and The Crescent/Minogue Crescent/Ross Street corridor to Parramatta Road to provide clarity on how these feeder routes are envisaged to operate in 2023 and 2033. It should include the modelling assumptions applied
- d) 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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>Attention Director</b>  Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  Department of Planning and Environment  GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>KEVIN CASSELLS</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>Kg Cassells</u></p> <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.  <small>I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</small></p> <p>Address: <u>77 WATKIN ST</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>NEWTOWN</u> Postcode <u>2042</u></p>
---	--

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: K. GASSOULS

Signature: [Signature]

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

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

Address: 77 WATKIN ST.

Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- I. 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
- II. 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 clearway.
- III. 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.
- IV. 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.

- V. Increased traffic congestion in areas around portals will increase pollution along roadsides, 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 enables them to be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.
- VI. EIS is Indicative only - 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.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning  
Services,  
Department of Planning and  
Environment

GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:

WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

LOUIS BARLAS

Signature:

*Louis Barlas*

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

Address:

2 Clissold St

Suburb:

ASHFIELD

Postcode


2131

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) 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.
- 2) The assessment states that there will be a net increase in GHG emissions in 2033 under the ‘with project’ scenario, however under the 2033 ‘cumulative’ scenario, there will be a net decrease in emissions (page 22–15). However, as the ‘cumulative’ scenario includes the Sydney Gateway and Western Harbor Tunnel projects, which are not yet confirmed to proceed, the ‘with project’ scenario should be considered as a likely outcome – which would see an increase in emissions. Both scenarios for 2033 show a reduction in emissions vs the ‘do minimum’ scenario. This is likely to rely on ‘free-flow’ conditions for the Project for most of the day. Should this not occur, the modelled outcomes could be significantly different.
- 3) Increased traffic on Gardeners Road will require land use planning changes that may decrease the value of land.
- 4) Recent experience tells us that numbers of people in the ongoing construction of Stages 1 and 2 have suffered extensive damage to their homes caused by vibration, tunnelling activities, and changed soil moisture content costing thousands of dollars to rectify, and although they followed all the elected procedures their claims have not been settled. Insurance policies will not cover this type of damage. The onus has been on them to prove that damage to their homes was caused by Westconnex. Furthermore, the EIS actually concedes that there will be moisture drawdown caused by tunnelling. There is nothing addressing these major concerns in the EIS. This is what residents in Annandale, Leichhardt and Lilyfield are facing and it is totally unacceptable.
- 5) The statements made that public transport cannot serve diverse areas are empirically incorrect. The area the Westconnex is being built in has higher public transport mode use than the Greater Metropolitan Area as noted in the IES.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> NIELS HEYVAERT <b>Signature:</b> 
<b>Attention: Director – Transport Assessments</b>	Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration: I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
<b>Application Number: SSI 7485</b> <b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b>	<b>Address:</b> 23 FERNDALE STREET <b>Suburb:</b> NEWTOWN <b>Postcode</b> 2042

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

- ⇒ I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.
- ⇒ This EIS contains no meaningful design and construction details and no parameters as to how broad changes and therefore impacts could be. It therefore fails to allow the community to be informed about and comment on the project impacts in a meaningful way.
- ⇒ The EIS at 7-25 refers to 876 comments (limited to 140 characters) made via the collaborative map on the Concept Design 'up to July' that were considered in the preparation of the EIS. It does not mention the many hundreds of extended written submissions that were lodged in late July and early August. These critical 'community engagement' feedback submissions have clearly not been considered in the preparation of the EIS. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
- ⇒ The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable
- ⇒ Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat - the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.
- ⇒ I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.
- ⇒ Many students walk or ride to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College schools via Darley Road. There are also a number of childcare centres very close to the Darley Road site.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

*Guin Stephens*

Signature:

*[Signature]*

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

Address:

Suburb: *Camperdown* Postcode

*2050*

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> <b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> CLEMENTE VALENTINO
<b>Application Number: SSI 7485</b>	<b>Address:</b> 7 HUMPHREYS AVE
<b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b>	<b>Suburb:</b> CASULA <b>Postcode</b> 2170
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration: I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

- The EIS 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?

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> Application Number: SSI 7485  Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Name: <u>GREGORY TRIKALIOTIS</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: <u>27 MYRA RD</u> Suburb: <u>DULWICH HILL</u> Postcode <u>2203</u>
---	--

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


- ❖ The EIS (including Appendix H) fails to provide traffic modelling outputs to assess impacts of the Project on CBD streets and intersections. Given the highly constrained and congested nature of the CBD, NSW Government policy focusses on reducing the number of cars in the CBD in favour of public transport, walking and cycling. The proponent should provide intersection performance results for the following intersections:
  - a) The ANZAC Bridge off-ramp to Allen Street/Botany Road
  - b) The Western Distributor off-ramp to Druitt Street (buses)
  - c) The Western Distributor off-ramp to Bathurst Street
  - d) The Western Distributor off-ramp to King Street/Sussex Street
  - e) Gardeners Road and Botany Road
  - f) All intersections within the modelled area in the Sydney CBD
- ❖ The traffic model used is an 'unconstrained' model. It assumes that all vehicles will travel on the route with the lowest "generalised cost" (i.e. combination of time and money). But it does not consider whether those routes have the capacity to handle all those vehicles. In the real world people change their time of travel, mode of travel and consider whether to make a trip at all to avoid congested routes. As a result travel patterns in the real world are very different to the patterns identified in models.
- ❖ Better use of existing road infrastructure has not been analysed as a feasible alternative. The EIS only refers to existing RMS programs. An analysis of urban road projects recommended in the State Infrastructure Strategy Update 2014 should be conducted as strategic alternatives including:
  - a) Smart Motorways investments on the M4, the Warringah Freeway and Southern Cross Drive-General Holmes Drive
  - b) Upgrading the Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic System (SCATS)
- ❖ The EIS refers to benefits from road projects that are not part of the project's scope. The full costs, benefits and impacts of these projects need to be considered in a transparent process.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: GREGORY TRIKAUOTIS

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 MYRA RD

Suburb: DULWICH HILL Postcode: 2203

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport  
Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:  
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- I 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 \_\_\_\_\_

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Maria Wallace</i> Signature: <i>M Wallace</i>
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: <i>25 Robert St. Argenton</i> Suburb: <i>Argenton</i> Postcode <i>2204</i>

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

- ⇒ I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.
- ⇒ This EIS contains no meaningful design and construction details and no parameters as to how broad changes and therefore impacts could be. It therefore fails to allow the community to be informed about and comment on the project impacts in a meaningful way.
- ⇒ The EIS at 7-25 refers to 876 comments (limited to 140 characters) made via the collaborative map on the Concept Design 'up to July' that were considered in the preparation of the EIS. It does not mention the many hundreds of extended written submissions that were lodged in late July and early August. These critical 'community engagement' feedback submissions have clearly not been considered in the preparation of the EIS. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
- ⇒ The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable
- ⇒ Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat - the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.
- ⇒ I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.
- ⇒ Many students walk or ride to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College schools via Darley Road. There are also a number of childcare centres very close to the Darley Road site.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: Lyne Jackson

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: 67 St Marys Street

Suburb: Camperdown 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

- i. 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.
- ii. 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.
- iii. 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.
- 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. 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.
- vi. 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

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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:

JEREMY DIMECH

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:

21/51 hereford st

Suburb:

GLEBE

Postcode:

2037

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:  
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

1. 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.
2. 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."
3. No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
4. In the EIS there are indications of what is to be expected in the Rozelle Rail Yards construction site and the Crescent Civil site. But the EIS states that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed. This may result in major changes to the project design and construction methodologies. The community will have no input into this process, so the community is totally powerless to be able to comment on what will actually be proposed, how it will be carried out and what will finally be built. This is not acceptable.
5. 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.

**Campaign Mailing Lists:** I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: Arca Bayburt

Signature: [Signature]

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

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

Address: 2/1-7 Empire Lane

Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2204

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:  
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- ◇ 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."
- ◇ 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.
- ◇ No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
- ◇ 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.
- ◇ In the EIS there are indications of what is to be expected in the Rozelle Rail Yards construction site and the Crescent Civil site. But the EIS states that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed. This may result in major changes to the project design and construction methodologies. The community will have no input into this process, so the community is totally powerless to be able to comment on what will actually be proposed, how it will be carried out and what will finally be built. This is not acceptable.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name:..... <u>MICHAEL KING</u> .....	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>14</u> <u>Michael King</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: ..... <u>14 CHAIR ST</u> .....	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>GRANVILLE</u> .....Postcode: <u>2142</u> .....	

**I submit my objection** to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects ?
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 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.
7. 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.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: Francine Elwasfi

Signature: Francine E

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: 20 Wilton St

Suburb: Sunny Hills Postcode: 2010

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport  
Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:  
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- (1) Flooding – Leichhardt. Darley Road and adjacent streets such as Hubert St are exposed to flood. The flood impact could be exacerbated by the disruption or blockage of existing drainage networks, which are risks identified in the EIS. The EIS has not assessed whether the identified risk to the existing drainage network will cause increased risk of flood damage to flood lots and it fails to take account of the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan which contains recommended flood modification options. The EIS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC\_FM3 to lay additional pipes/culverts from Elswick Street to Hawthorne Canal (via Regent Street and Darley Road). RMS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC\_FM4 to lay additional pipes/ culverts from William Street to Hawthorne Canal via Hubert Street and Darley Road. The EIS should not be approved as it has not properly explained or assessed these impacts.
- (2) The substation and water treatment plant should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link. This will mean that the site is less visible to residents and most pedestrian access is at this end. There are no homes that will have direct line of sight of the facility if it is moved. This will also enable direct pedestrian access to the light rail without the need to use the winding path at the rear of the site which creates safety issues and adds to the time required to access the light rail stop.
- (3) 1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.
- (4) I oppose the destruction of any more of Sydney's heritage for WestCONnex. I am appalled that Sydney Motorway Corporation is seeking approval to tunnel under hundreds of highly valued heritage buildings in Newtown without any serious assessment of risk at all. This heritage belongs to all of Sydney.
- (5) I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.
- (6) The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**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: Helen Martin

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

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

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

Address: 4 Garnet Avenue

Suburb: hilyfield NSW 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 Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Eloise Sa-delic</i>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <i>25 Reynolds St</i> Suburb: <i>Cremorne</i> Postcode <i>2090</i>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 	
<p>Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website  <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>		

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

JESSICA CUNNINGHAM

Signature:

Jessica Cunningham

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

Address:

1206/13 Stirling CC

Suburb:

Campan

Postcode

2050

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 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.
- 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 ?

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485


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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Kym Hurst

Signature:



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

Address:

6134-36 GOULD AVE

Suburb:

LEWIS HAM

Postcode


2049

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. In relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.
- vi. EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_


<b>Attention Director</b> <b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> KUM HURST
<b>Application Number: SSI 7485</b>	<b>Address:</b> 6/34-36 GOULD AVE <b>Suburb:</b> LEWISHAM <b>Postcode</b> 2049
<b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b>	<b>Signature:</b> 
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration: I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

- The EIS 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?

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: <b>KYM HURST</b>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <b>6/34-36 GOULD AVE</b>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <b>LEWIS HAM</b>	Postcode <b>2049</b>
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		
Signature: 		

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

- I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project, There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Pefers 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 \_\_\_\_\_


<p><b>Attention Director</b>  Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  Department of Planning and Environment  GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>KUM HURST</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>[Signature]</u></p> <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission on your website.  I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>6134-36 GOULD AVE</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>LEWIS HAM</u> Postcode: <u>2049</u></p>
---	--

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: KUM HEST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: 6/34-36 GOULD AVE
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: LEWISHAM Postcode 2049
Signature: 	
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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


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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

I 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: SUSAN SHARRE

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: 26 BEATTIE ST

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul> | <p>not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_


Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>URSULA URE</u>	
	Address: <u>TILBA AVE</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>BALMAIN</u>	Postcode <u>2041</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>D. Ure</u>	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> 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:

- 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 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 be 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 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> <b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> Lyn Fraser
	<b>Address:</b> 140 Wene Road St
<b>Application Number:</b> SSI 7485	<b>Suburb:</b> Forest Lodge <b>Postcode</b> 2037
<b>Application Name:</b> WestConnex M4-M5 Link	<b>Signature:</b> 
<p align="center">Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website  <b>Declaration:</b> I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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

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

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: ROSA NEDITH

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: 23 THEODORE ST

Suburb: BARMAH 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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>ROSA NEZDICH</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: <u>23 THEODORE ST</u> Suburb: <u>BALMAIN</u> Postcode <u>2041</u>

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

- 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 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 be 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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from: Name: <u>ROSA NEEDHAM</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: <u>23 THEODORE ST</u> Suburb: <u>BALMAIN</u> Postcode <u>2041</u>	Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
---	--

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

- ❖ 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 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.
- ❖ 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?

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_


<p><b>Attention Director</b>  Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  Department of Planning and Environment  GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Alyssa Bird</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>[Signature]</u></p> <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.  I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>32 Seegenhore st a</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Arncliffe</u> Postcode <u>2205</u></p>
---	---

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment Application Number: SSI 7485 GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	From: Name: <i>Shelley Parker</i> Address: <i>26/4 Alexander Dr</i>
Application Name: Westconnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <i>Campandown</i> Postcode <i>2050</i>
Declaration : I <b>have not</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Please include <del>delete</del> (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website 

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

- The planning for WestCONnex has been completely undemocratic. Independent evidence that tollways are not the solution to Sydney's Traffic Congestion has been ignored and instead the NSW government is wasting billions of public money.
- 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?
- 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.
- WestCONnex has chosen Darley Road as a dive site despite the fact that it is the third most dangerous traffic spot in the Inner West. They have ignored advice from an independent engineer that it is not suitable.
- The WestConnex Traffic model should not be confidential. It should immediately be released to Councils and the public so that it can be independently reviewed and tested.
- 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.
- I am opposed to even more destruction of heritage buildings in the Inner West. Already scores have been demolished in St Peters and Haberfield.
- 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.

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 \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>Attention Director</b>  Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  Department of Planning and Environment  GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Carl Glaister</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>C. Glaister</u></p> <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.  I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>21 Riversdale Avenue</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Kuama Downs</u> Postcode <u>2533</u></p>
---	--

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 \_\_\_\_\_


<b>Attention Director</b> <b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> <i>Carl Glaister</i>
<b>Application Number: SSI 7485</b>	<b>Address:</b> <i>21 Riversdale Avenue</i>
<b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b>	<b>Suburb:</b> <i>Kiama Downs</i> <b>Postcode</b> <i>2533</i>
<p style="text-align: center;">Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website  <b>Declaration: I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> <b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> Garry Dalrymple
	<b>Address:</b> 1 Eulabach Avenue
<b>Application Number:</b> SSI 7485	<b>Suburb:</b> Earlwood <b>Postcode</b> 2206
<b>Application Name:</b> WestConnex M4-M5 Link	<b>Signature:</b> 
<p align="center">Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website  <b>Declaration : I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> Application Number: SSI 7485	Name: <u>Julian Schimmel</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: <u>31 Harrow Rd</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <u>Stannore</u> Postcode: <u>2048</u>

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> <b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> L. Blumhagen
<b>Application Number: SSI 7485</b>	<b>Address:</b> 81 Gardeners Rd <b>Suburb:</b> Kingsford <b>Postcode:</b> 2032
<b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b>	<b>Signature:</b> L. Blumhagen
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration: I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Theo Van der Schie</i> Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration : I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: <i>17 Nelson St</i> Suburb: <i>Annandale</i> Postcode <i>2038</i>

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Irina Garri

Signature:

Irina Garri

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

Address:

4 James St

Suburb:

Petersham

Postcode

2049

**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 from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Iana Grasse</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>4 James St</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Petersham</u> Postcode: <u>2049</u>	

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

- The 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.
- 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.
- 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."
- 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.

**Campaign Mailing Lists :** I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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:..... *Erina Gracie*

Signature:..... *Erina Gracie*

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:..... *A James St*

Suburb:..... *Petersham* Postcode..... *2049*

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Thina Janni</i>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <i>4 James St</i>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <i>Petersham</i>	Postcode <i>2049</i>
	Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years		

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

- a) 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 \$20Billion 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.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> Application Number: SSI 7485 Application  Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>FRANCESCO GABRIELLI</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Please <del>include</del> / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: _____
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <u>REDFERN</u> Postcode: <u>2016</u>

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

- 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.
- Hundreds of risks associated with this project have not been assessed but have instead been deferred to a detailed design stage into which the public will have no input. I call on the Department of Planning to reject this inadequate EIS that has been prepared by AECOM that has multiple commercial interests in WestConnex.
- The EIS 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.
- Increased traffic congestion in areas around portals will increase pollution along roadsides, 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 enables them to be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.
- 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.
- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. "..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval". It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a "review(ed) for consistency", and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie : the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)
- The 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Bernard Hokey

Signature:

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

Address:

3 Oxley St

Suburb:

Tempe

Postcode

2074

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


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

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: Pierre Leeshan

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: 40 Merton St

Suburb: Rozelle Postcode: 2039

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. 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.
- B. 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.
- C. 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.
- D. 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).
- E. 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.
- F. I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.
- G. 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.
- H. 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 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. 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.
- J. OTHER :

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>neusie</u>	Planning Services,
Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	Department of Planning and Environment
	GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
<b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>1/82 Campbell Street</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Sunny Hills</u> Postcode: <u>2610</u>	

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

- FOR THE CONCEPT DESIGN FOR THE M4/M5 AND BEFORE PRELIMINARY DRILLING TO ESTABLISH A ROUTE THROUGH THE INNER WEST IS COMPLETED. WHAT IS THE RUSH? THIS EIS IS LITTLE MORE THAN A CONCEPT DESIGN AND IS FAR LESS DEVELOPED THAN EARLIER ONES. IT IS COMPOSED OF MANY INDICATE ONLY PLANS SUCH THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO KNOW WHAT THE IMPACTS WILL BE AND YET APPROVAL IS BEING SOUGHT IN A RUSH. THE EIS IGNORES MORE THAN 1500 SUBMISSIONS, INCLUDING ONE OF 142 PAGES FROM THE INNER WEST COUNCIL.
- B. ONE TOLL ROAD LEADS TO ANOTHER 3 BEING PROPOSED. THE EIS'S FOR THE M4 EAST AND THE NEW M5 ARGUED THE CASE THAT SERIOUS CONGESTION CREATED NEAR INTERCHANGES WOULD BE SOLVED ONCE THE M4/M5 WAS BUILT. NOW IT SEEMS THIS IS NOT THE CASE AND MORE ROADS WILL BE NEEDED TO RELIEVE THE CONGESTION – WHERE DOES THIS END? ACCORDING TO THE M4/M5 EIS THE REAL BENEFITS WILL DEPEND ON BUILDING THE WESTERN HARBOUR TUNNEL, THE AIRPORT LINK AND A TOLLWAY HEADING SOUTH. NONE OF THESE PROJECTS HAVE BEEN PLANNED, LET ALONE APPROVED BUT YET ARE PART OF ADDRESSING THE CONGESTION IMPACTS ACKNOWLEDGED FOR THE M4/M5LINK PROJECT. GIVEN THIS HOW IS IT POSSIBLE TO KNOW OR ADDRESS THE IMPACTS OF THE M4/M5 LINK, UNLESS THIS IS JUST YET MORE JUSTIFICATION FOR YET MORE ROADS?
- C. RESEARCH ABOUT ROADS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATES THAT ROADS CREATE CONGESTION. THE WESTCONNEX PROJECT IS NO DIFFERENT AND THE EIS CLEARLY INDICATES THAT THIS IS AN IMPACT OF THE M4/M5 AND THE CONSEQUENT ROADS THAT WILL FOLLOW. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE M4/M5 LINK
- EIS ITSELF INDICATES THE RMS IS ALREADY HARD AT WORK CONSIDERING HOW TO SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS – OF CONGESTION CAUSED BY ROADS.
- D. WHERE IS THE COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND TO LONG TERM PLANNING WHEN THE EIS FOR THE M4/M5 LINK IS RELEASED BEFORE ANY RESPONSE TO THE EXTENSIVE COMMUNITY FEEDBACK ON THE M4-M5 LINK CONCEPT DESIGN COULD POSSIBLY HAVE BEEN SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED. THIS DEMONSTRATES DEEP GOVERNMENT CONTEMPT FOR THE PEOPLE OF NSW AND THE COMMUNITIES OF THE INNER WEST OF SYDNEY IN PARTICULAR.
- E. THE EIS WAS PREPARED BY GLOBAL ENGINEERING FIRM AECOM, WHICH ALSO PREPARED THE EIS FOR STAGES 1 AND 2. WHEN HE APPROVED THESE EARLIER STAGES, THE THEN MINISTER FOR PLANNING ROB STOKES POINTED TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THAT WOULD MINIMISE IMPACTS ON COMMUNITIES. BUT THE IMPACTS HAVE TURNED OUT TO WORSE THAN EXPECTED.
- F. FOR EXAMPLE, THE AECOM EIS FOR THE NEW M5 FAILED TO DEAL WITH HOW THE MASSIVELY CONTAMINATED LAND FILL AT ALEXANDRIA WOULD BE MANAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION. AFTER MONTHS OF SICKENING ODOURS, THE NSW EPA ADMITS THAT DESPITE FINING SMC AND REQUIRING CONTRACTORS TO TAKE MEASURES TO CONTROL ODOURS, THEY HAVE NOT STOPPED. IT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT IT DOES NOT HAVE THE POWER TO STOP WORK UNTIL WESTCONNEX CONTRACTORS COMPLY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from: Name: <u>Jade Begbie</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: <u>5/22 Cecil St</u> Suburb: <u>Ashfield</u> Postcode: <u>2131</u>	Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
---	--

**I submit 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 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.*
- *Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. There is however a caveat - the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.*
- *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 assessment of Strategic Alternative 2 (Investment in "alternative transport" modes) should:*
  - *identify key network capacity issues*
  - *identify the shift away from private vehicles required to deliver the necessary relief on the road network to meet the future transport needs of Sydney*
  - *identify the mix of investments in public transport, cycling and walking required to deliver these mode splits.*
  - *use multi-modal transport modelling and economic assessment to inform the analysis and assessment of the alternative.*
- *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.*

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: JAZK BELBIE

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: 5122 Cecil St

Suburb: Ashfield Postcode 2131

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

- We 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 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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:..... JACIL BEGBIE

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:..... 5122 Cecil St

Suburb:..... Ashfield Postcode: 2131

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485  
Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- The EIS 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.
- The EIS indicates that 36 homes will have unacceptable noise impacts for extended periods at the Darley road construction site. The EIS does not mention the cumulative impact of aircraft noise in the Leichhardt or St Peters area, and therefore does not reflect the true impact of construction noise on the amenity of nearby residents and businesses. The noise impacts of construction are not able to be mitigated to an acceptable level and the EIS should not be approved on this basis.
- 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.
- No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
- 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.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: JACK BECIBIE

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: 5122 Cecil St

Suburb: Ashfield Postcode: 2131

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485  
Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- The 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.
- 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 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- The Darley Road site should be rejected because it involves acquiring Dan Murphy's. This business was rennovated

**Campaign Mailing Lists:** I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Submission to:

Name:.....

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

Signature:.....

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

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

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

Application Number: SSI 7485  
Application

Address:.....

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

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

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.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: JACK BENBIE

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: 5/22 Cecil St

Suburb: Ashfield Postcode: 2131

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485  
Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction. (Executive Summary xviii)
- The EIS states that '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)
- 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.
- 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 does not provide any opportunity to comment on the urban design and landscape component of the project. It states that 'a detailed review and finalisation of the architectural treatment of the project operational infrastructure would be undertaken 'during detailed design'. The Community should be given an opportunity to comment upon and influence the design and we object to the approval of the EIS on the basis that this detail is not provided, nor is the community (or other stakeholders) given an opportunity to comment or influence the final design.
- The 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)

**Campaign Mailing Lists:** I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> Application Number: SSI 7485	Name: <u>ALLEN LEE</u>
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Signature: <u>ALLEN LEE</u> Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: <u>41-71 Lombard St</u> Suburb: <u>Glebe</u> Postcode: <u>2037</u>

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 \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Aletia D

Signature:

Aletia D

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

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

Address:

Dulwich Hill

Suburb:

Dulwich Hill

Postcode

2203

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Jacqueline Hublin</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>10 King St</u> Suburb: <u>Balmain</u> Postcode <u>2041</u>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>J. Hublin</u>	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> 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:

- 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 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 be 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 \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Jacqueline Lublin</u>	
	Address: <u>10 King St</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Balmain</u>	Postcode <u>2041</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>J.R. Lublin</u>	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Jacqueline Lublin</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>10 King St</u>	Postcode <u>2041</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <u>Bdmain</u> Signature: <u>J. R. Lublin</u>	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

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

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


**I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application**

**# SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.**

Name:

Manuel Emilio

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 Station Street

Suburb:

Newton

Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

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 as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.**

Name: ADRIENNE BARRINGTON AIGGS

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 MORRISSEY ROAD

Suburb: ERRINBIE Postcode: 2043

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I. 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.

II. 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.

III. 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.

IV. 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.

V. 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.

VI. 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.


VII. Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution- most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a massive number of extra truck movements and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: ADRIQUE HUGGS

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 MORRISSET RD

Suburb: BRISBANEVILLE Postcode: 2043

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Nicole De Palo</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>N De Palo</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>8 Noble St</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Concord</u> Postcode: .....	

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: NORMAN BARRINGTON-HIGGS

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 MORRISSEY RD

Suburb: ERSKINEVILLE Postcode: 2043

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

1. 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 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.
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-M5 link – in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area – in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other.
5. 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 \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**  
Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Name: NORMAN BARRINGTON-HIGGS,

Signature: 

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

Address: 11 MORRISSEY RD, ERSKINEVILLE

Suburb: ERSKINEVILLE


Postcode 2043.

*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 23<sup>rd</sup> 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 \_\_\_\_\_

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: NAUR ZOETMULDER Signature: 
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: 3/27 EDGEWARE ROAD Suburb: ENMORE      Postcode 2042

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

- The EIS refers to be 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.
- 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.
- 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 application #SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: NOUR ZOETMULOER

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: 3127 EDGEWARE ROAD

Suburb: ENMORE Postcode: 2042

- A. 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.
- B. 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.
- C. I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.
- 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. 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.
- F. 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.
- G. The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <b>NOUE ZOETMULDER</b>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <b>3127 EDGEWARE ROAD</b>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <b>ENMORE</b>	Postcode <b>2042</b>
Signature:  Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

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

- The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.
- 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.
- 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 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 \_\_\_\_\_

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Peter Bradbury</i> Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: <i>5/16-18 Waterloo st</i> Suburb: <i>Burghills</i> Postcode <i>2010</i>

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

- ⇒ I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.
- ⇒ This EIS contains **no meaningful design** and construction details and no parameters as to how broad changes and therefore impacts could be. It therefore fails to allow the community to be informed about and comment on the project impacts in a meaningful way.
- ⇒ The EIS at 7-25 refers to 876 comments (limited to 140 characters) made via the collaborative map on the Concept Design 'up to July' that were considered in the preparation of the EIS. It does not mention the many hundreds of extended written submissions that were lodged in late July and early August. These critical 'community engagement' feedback submissions have clearly not been considered in the preparation of the EIS. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
- ⇒ The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable
- ⇒ Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat - the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.
- ⇒ I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.
- ⇒ Many students walk or ride to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College schools via Darley Road. There are also a number of childcare centres very close to the Darley Road site.

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>FRAN MUNRO</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>15 School Parade</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Marncliffe</u> Postcode: <u>2204</u>	

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

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 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
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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
7. 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 \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from: Name: <u>FRAN MUNRO</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Please <b>include / delete (cross out or circle)</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: <u>15 School Pde</u> Suburb: <u>Narrmchville</u> Postcode: <u>2204</u>	Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
--	--

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Increased traffic congestion in areas around portals will increase pollution along roadsides, 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 enables them to be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.
5. 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.
6. 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)
7. 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.
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. 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.
10. 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.

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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: FRAN MUNRO

Signature: [Signature]

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

Address: 15 School Pde

Suburb: Marrichville Postcode: 2204

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>FRAN MUNRO</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>15 School Pde</u>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <u>Marrickville</u>	Postcode <u>2204</u>
	Signature: <u>franco</u>	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> 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. The EIS admits that air pollutants will exceed permitted levels along the Canal Rd used to access the St Peters Interchange because the traffic will be heavier. This is an unacceptable impact which will adversely affect vehicle users because it is known that people in their vehicles are not protected from the air pollution, as well as anyone on foot or cycling in the streets around the interchange. No amelioration is offered.
2. The EIS states that traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange is expected to be worse after completion of the M5 and the M4-M5 Link particularly in the evening peak hour. The EIS admits that this will have a "moderate negative" impact on the neighbourhood in increasing pollution (also admitted separately) therefore in health impacts, on safety for foot and cycle traffic but also for vehicles and on the local amenity.
3. The traffic around St Peters expected to be heavier because of the increased road access to the new Interchange will adversely affect our community because moving around to our parks and to the shops, to the buses and to the train stations, for pedestrians and cars, will be more difficult. Our community is being sacrificed for the marginal improvement in traffic movement elsewhere in Sydney. No measures to ameliorate the impact are mentioned. This is unacceptable.
4. The EIS admits that the increased traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange will impact on bus running times especially in the evening peak hour and increase the time taken (2.5 minutes, which seems optimistic). The 422 bus and associated cross city services which use the Princes Highway are notorious for irregular running times because of the congestion on the Princes highway and cross roads, so an admitted worsening of the running time will adversely impact the people who are dependent on the buses. This will be compounded by the loss of train services at St Peters station while it is closed for the Sydney Metro build and then subsequently when it re-opens. In all the impact of the new M5 and the M4-M5 link is to worsen access to public transport significantly for the residents of the St Peters neighbourhood.
5. It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: FRAN MUNRO

Signature: [Signature]

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

Address: 15 School Pde

Suburb: Narrickville Postcode 2204

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments


Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

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.
- Hundreds of risks associated with this project have not been assessed but have instead been deferred to a detailed design stage into which the public will have no input. I call on the Department of Planning to reject this inadequate EIS that has been prepared by AECOM that has multiple commercial interests in WestConnex.
- The EIS 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.
- Increased traffic congestion in areas around portals will increase pollution along roadsides, 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 enables them to be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.
- 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.
- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. "..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval". It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a "review(ed) for consistency", and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie : the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)
- The 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Luen Chee Lai</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: 	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
<small>Please <b>include / delete (cross out or circle)</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</small>	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>22 Caldwell parade</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Jayong</u> Postcode: <u>2199</u>	

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

- ✦ 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)

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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


Application Name:

WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Daniel Goodace

Signature:



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

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

Address:

64 Reiby st

Suburb:

Newtown

Postcode

2042

**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 addition of 70-100 light vehicle movements day in Leichhardt will result in our small, congested streets, which are already at capacity and suffering parking shortages, will have the added impact of workers travelling to and from the site and parking in local streets. There will be rat running. The EIS should provide an agreed route (using arterial roads only) that can be used by all vehicles associated with the project.
- ✦ According to the EIS, buses travelling to the CBD will be slower, despite the construction of a tunnel between Iron Cove and the Anzac Bridge. Bus travel times along Parramatta Road will improve, but only because bus lanes would be extended. This could be achieved without WestConnex and for several billions of dollars less.
- ✦ It is stated that the hugely expensive Stage 3 M4/M5 link is required as a link between the two motorways. This is totally untrue. The A3 is the primary eastern link between the two motorways and it is described in the State Road network system as the M4-M5 Connector.
- ✦ 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.
- ✦ Significant improvements in rapid public transport are required for significant urban renewal. The experience in Sydney is that public transport is a strong and effective catalyst for urban renewal e.g. Green Square; Ultimo-Pyrmont with light rail; the Anzac Parade corridor, again with light rail; and Sydney Metro City and South West at Waterloo and along the Bankstown Line. The key ingredient is the political will to reallocate road space to rapid transit, or invest in dedicated rail solutions.
- ✦ To the west there are the M7, A6 and A3 connections. There has been no modelling provided of whether with appropriate upgrades these connections might provide far more cost effective and time efficient connections, particularly given their alignments would service multiple demand corridors.
- ✦ The EIS does not set out a credible strategic rationale for WestConnex. There is no informed discussion on the economic geography of Sydney, and the role an integrated transport system has to play in meeting the needs of businesses and residents.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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:	JULIE ANNANDALE	
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 donations in the last two years.		
Address:	6 CLOFTON ST	
Suburb:	ANNANDALE	Postcode: 2040

29.17

I wish to register my strong objections to Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link). My reasons are set out below:

1. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur (Ch X, p y), 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.
  2. 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**. As you are no doubt aware, 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. As Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school"
  3. Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces provided for workers (EiS). The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately 550. This means that there will be **150 vehicles** will need to park in **nearby local streets** which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.
  4. 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 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 will become gridlocked during peak times.
  5. 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 leads to extra noise and air pollution in this area.
  6. 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.
  7. Unacceptable noise levels will accompany the construction of this massive interchange. No analysis has been provided of the magnitude of increased noise pollution in this area.
- There will also be disturbance of soil which may be thick with contaminants such as lead and asbestos (as was the case in St Peters.) You made no provision for the safe removal of these toxic substances in St Peters and I do not see any provision in the EiS for their safe removal in this area.

<b>Attention Director</b> Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <b>EDOUARD LE LESLE</b>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <b>2312 COVLSON ST</b>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <b>ERSKINEVILLE</b> Postcode <b>2043</b>
Signature: 	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

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




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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from: Name: <u>Vanessa Stevenson</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: <u>5/125 Euston Road</u> Suburb: <u>Alexandria</u> Postcode: <u>2015</u>	Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
--	--

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

- 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.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name:	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: 	Postcode
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb:  Signature: 	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. Declaration: I <b>HAVE NOT</b> 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. 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 for project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail.
- 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.

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

Name  Email  Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

**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**

- o *All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street) should have a strict prohibition on any truck movements and worker contractor parking. These homes are already suffering the worst construction impacts of the work on the site and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and additional noise impacts. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all of these streets.*
- o *The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed. All possible mitigation should be included as a condition of approval. The EIS acknowledges that substantial above ground invasive works will be required to demolish the Dan Murphys building and establish the road. The EIS noise projections indicate that for 10 weeks residents will suffer unacceptable noise impacts. The EIS does not contain a plan to manage or mitigate this terrible impact. There is no detail as to which homes will be offered (if at all) temporary relocation; there are no details of any noise walls or what treatments will be provided to individual homes that are badly affected. The approval needs to contain detail as to how this unacceptable impact will be managed and minimised during the construction period and, in particular, during site establishment. I object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that the works required (demolition and surface works) will create unacceptable and unbearable noise and vibration impacts for extended periods. The EIS indicates that at least 36 homes will basically be unlivable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.*
- o *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.*

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

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

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

---

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

1. I object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. I object 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.
3. 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 provide that 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.
4. 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.
5. The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed or any detail provided. All possible mitigation should be included as a condition of approval. The EIS acknowledges that substantial above ground invasive works will be required to demolish the Dan Murphys building and establish the road. The EIS noise projections indicate that for 10 weeks residents will suffer unacceptable noise impacts. The EIS does not contain a plan to manage or mitigate this terrible impact. There is no detail as to which homes will be offered (if at all) temporary relocation; there are no details of any noise walls or what treatments will be provided to individual homes that are badly affected. The approval needs to contain detail as to how this unacceptable impact will be managed and minimised during the construction period and, in particular, during site establishment. I object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that the works required (demolition and surface works) will create unacceptable and unbearable noise and vibration impacts for extended periods. The EIS indicates that at least 36 homes will basically be unlivable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.
6. The EIS does not even 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
------	-------	--------

Submission from: Name: <u>Olivia Savil</u> Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. Address: <u>9/173 Glebe point Rd Bridge Rd</u> Suburb: <u>glebe</u> Postcode: <u>2037</u>	Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
--	--

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: Thelma Baga

Signature: T.B.

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: 109 Alice St

Suburb: Newtown Postcode:

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Vivian TharL Duong</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>65 Wyndham St</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Alexandria</u> Postcode: <u>2015</u>	

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Marianne Polkinghorne</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>16/8x BUCKLAND ST</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>CLIPPENDALE</u> Postcode: <u>2058</u>	

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

- I 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 choices extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. ( page 106)
- Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. There is however a caveat - the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.
- I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.
- I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Marianne Polkinghorne</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>16/34 BUCKLAND ST</u> Suburb: <u>CHIPPENDALE</u> Postcode <u>2008</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>
Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration : I HAVE NOT</b> 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. 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 ?
2. 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.
3. 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.
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. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.
9. I 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.
10. 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 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> <b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> <i>Marianne Polkinghorne</i>
<b>Application Number: SSI 7485</b>	<b>Address:</b> <i>16/34 Buckland St</i>
<b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b>	<b>Suburb:</b> <i>Chippendale</i> <b>Postcode</b> <i>2008</i>
<p align="center">Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website  <b>Declaration: I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** Marianne Polkinghorne <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 15 October 2017 4:39 PM  
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox  
**Subject:** Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16\_7485

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

## SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I request that you stop this project immediately, for the following reasons.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Marianne Polkinghorne 16/34 Buckland St, Chippendale NSW 2008, Australia

---

This email was sent by Marianne Polkinghorne 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](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Marianne provided an email address ([mariannepolkinghorne@gmail.com](mailto:mariannepolkinghorne@gmail.com)) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Marianne Polkinghorne at [mariannepolkinghorne@gmail.com](mailto:mariannepolkinghorne@gmail.com).

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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: SIMON WEST

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: 157 A GEORGE ST

Suburb: ERSKINE VILLE Postcode: 2043

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- I. 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.
- II. 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.
- III. 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.
- IV. 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.
- V. 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.

- VI. 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.
- VII. Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution- most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a massive number of extra truck movements and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Simon West</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>157 A GEORGE ST</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <u>ERSKINEVILLE</u> Postcode <u>2043</u>
Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration:</b> I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Submission to:**

Name: Simon West

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

Signature: [Signature]

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

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

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

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Address: 157 A GEORGE ST


Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Suburb: ERSKINEVILLE Postcode: 2043

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Jane Dune</u>
	Address: <u>16 Wells St</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Newtown NSW</u> Postcode <u>2042</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> 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. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.
- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used. The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.
- I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> <i>Quentin Evans</i> <b>Signature:</b> <i>[Signature]</i>
<b>Attention: Director – Transport Assessments</b>	Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration : I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
<b>Application Number: SSI 7485</b> <b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b>	<b>Address:</b> <i>93 Victoria Rd</i> <b>Suburb:</b> <i>Harrickville</i> <b>Postcode</b> <i>2204</i>

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>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 <b>NO</b> 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.</p> <p>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</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
|---|--|

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name:

WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Judith Coombes

Signature:

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

Address:

5 Justin St

Suburb:

Lilyfield NSW, Postcode 2040

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 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.
- II. 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.
- III. 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.
- IV. 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

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: TOBIASSignature: [Signature]

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

Address: 25 Forsyth StSuburb: Clebe

Postcode

2037**I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:**

- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.
- o 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
- o 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.
- o Impacts not provided – Permanent water treatment plant and substation – The EIS states that there will be an office, worker parking and buildings to accommodate this facility on a permanent basis. It does not provide any detail as to – noise impacts, numbers of workers on site, any health risks associated with the facility. This is simply inadequate and the decision to locate this facility should be subject to a thorough assessment and approval process. It should not be approved as part of this EIS as there is simply no detail provided about the impact of this facility on the amenity of the area.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: Josh Formosa

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: 23 Mona St

Suburb: unitedfield Postcode 4870

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

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

- ◇ The EIS states that these will occur near the Darley Road site. There is no detail provided, nor is there a process by which residents can influence such decisions. The Inner West Council's documents state that Darley Road is not built to normal road requirements and safety standards, as it was

established as an access road for the former goods line. Two fatalities have occurred near the site location, with many accidents. The Council has been trying to make Darley Road a safer route for many years. Elwick Street North for example was partially closed as a result of a fatality. The approval conditions need to make it clear that all road closures need to be made in consultation with residents affected and that the safety issues are adequately addressed. No arterial traffic from Darley Road should be allowed to be diverted onto narrow local roads

- ◇ EIS is Indicative only - 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.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: Clay Douglas

Signature: [Signature]

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

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

Address: 2 Don St

Suburb: Murthorn Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport  
Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:  
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The 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 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: Zio Ledent

Signature: Zio Ledent

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

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

Address: 8/195 Rochford St

Suburb: Erskineville Postcode: 2043

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- ◆ All traffic modelling is wrong, the question is: by how much? And what are the implications of the error? Incorrect traffic modelling has led to overoptimistic traffic predictions which resulted in low toll revenue from of the Cross City Tunnel, Lane Cove Tunnel and Brisconnex in Brisbane, resulting in eventual bankruptcy. The traffic modelling process used to develop the Project is fundamentally flawed because:
  - a) Traffic projections are likely to be significantly different to the actual traffic on the street network
  - b) Traffic volumes projected in the model are in numerous instances well above the physical capacity of the road network.
- ◆ The EIS asserts that the M4-M5 link would complete the orbital road network between western Sydney and the eastern gateways of Port Botany and Sydney Airport (p4.4). That orbital already exists in the form of the 110km Sydney Orbital - the M2, M7, M5, Eastern Distributor, Harbour Tunnel, Gore Hill Freeway and Lane Cove Tunnel.
- ◆ Generally the risk of settlement is lessened where tunnelling is more that 35m. In the Rozelle area the tunnel will be at 30m in the Brockley St & Cheltenham St area, and it will be less than that in the Denison St area. Also it is planned to have another layer of tunnels above that in the Denison St area. From the cross section diagram Vol 2B appendix E part 2 the suggestion is that this higher level of tunnels will be at no more than 12m. This is of major concern. Numbers of people in the ongoing construction of Stage 1 and 2 have suffered extensive damage to their homes costing thousands of dollars to rectify caused by vibration and tunneling activities and although they followed all the elected procedures their claims have not been settled. This is totally unacceptable. There is nothing addressing these major concerns in the EIS.
- ◆ The EIS was released just 12 days after the closing date for submissions to the Concept Design. This proves the Concept Design and the submissions were a sham. There were hundreds of posts on the interactive map and there were over thousand written submissions. There is no way these submissions could have been read, evaluated, their points integrated, and the 7500 page EIS edited, printed, checked and distributed in 12 days. The EIS was obviously prepared prior to the closing of submission to the Concept Design. This is a total abuse of the NSW Planning Laws.
- ◆ The introduction of the EIS clearly states that the information in the EIS is "indicative" of the final design only. The reality of this statement means that the project may be completely different to stated plans in the EIS. Furthermore although the EIS indicates what is to be expected when construction begins, it also states that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed upon. This may result in major changes to the project design and construction methodologies. The community would have no say in this process.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: Matthew Mouritzen

Signature: Matthew Mouritzen

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: 10 Holmwood St

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:  
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

**Campaign Mailing Lists:** I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: Lulu Cicci-Donnelly

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: 51 Kingsclear Rd

Suburb: Alexandria Postcode: 2015

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 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> <b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> <i>Sarah Bullock</i>
<b>Application Number: SSI 7485</b>	<b>Address:</b> <i>9/20 Fitzgerald St.</i>
<b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b>	<b>Suburb:</b> <i>Newbury</i> <b>Postcode</b> <i>2042</i>
<b>Signature:</b> <i>Sarah Bullock</i>	
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration: I HAVE NOT</b> 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. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.
- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used. The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.
- I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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 OPENSHAW

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 HORDERN ST

Suburb: NEWTOWN NSW Postcode 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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. 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.
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. 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.
5. 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.
6. The EIS states that the impact on regional air quality is minimal and thus concludes that the project's impact on ozone is negligible. Ozone is a major pollutant and Western Sydney, Campbelltown in particular, suffers the worst ozone pollution. Major components of ozone are generated in eastern Sydney and drift west. Previous environment departments have spoken about the need for an eight-hour standard concentration and goal for ozone (DECCEW, 2010, State of Knowledge: Ozone). OEHL needs to provide information about the value of this standard and on the impact of new motorways on that level.
7. The EIS (App H, p.269) refers to the RMS plans to carry out "network integration" works surrounding the Rozelle interchange once the project is complete but offers little detail of the nature of the works. It mentions the intersection of the Western Distributor and Pyrmont Bridge Road at Pyrmont, Western Distributor near Darling Harbour and a review of kerbside uses near Western Distributor, The Crescent, Johnston Street and Ross Street.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_


**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: DAVID OPENSHAW

Signature: 

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

Address: 43 HOKERN ST

Suburb: NEWTOWN NSW Postcode 2042

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning  
Services,Department of Planning and  
Environment

GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:

WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

DAVID OPENSHAW

Signature:

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

Address:

43 HORDERN ST

Suburb:

NEWTOWN NSW

Postcode 2042

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 nature of proposed "post-opening mitigation measures" (Page 223, Chapter 9.8, Appendix H) are unknown and their impacts could be significant including intersection and road widening (and associated property loss), banning parking in local centres, removal of trees, footpaths and cycling facilities. The people of NSW have a reasonable expectation to understand whether such impacts form part of the Project and they should be detailed in the EIS. They should not be left to a "wait and see" approach. Not only a proper analysis of demand, but also of traffic dispersion should be provided for connecting roads up to three kilometres from every exit and entry portal and the capacity of those roads analysed.
- B. I object to the whole project but particularly the tolls which are unfair when people living west of Parramatta really need alternative to western neighborhoods north-south. If we had better public transport then many of us would not have to drive and this would reduce the traffic.
- C. The strategic model (whole system) inputs traffic volumes that simply cannot be accommodated in the road interchanges and feeder routes. It is physically impossible to fit that amount of traffic on a road.
- D. The induced demand of 0.3% is too low based on historical experience in Sydney. The benefits counted from reduced traffic volumes on roads such as the existing M5 and the Eastern Distributor are unlikely to be realized due to real levels of induced demand
- E. The modelling process incorporates a highly unusual definition of induced traffic (p.45 of Appendix H). Induced traffic should not include the increase in trips due population growth and land use changes as these are modelled elsewhere.
- F. The EIS notes that "in preparing the traffic staging plans during construction the key considerations (...) include maintaining traffic and lane capacity (...) on the arterial road network, particularly during peak periods; minimising impacts on public transport services (...); and minimising impacts on key active transport links". Existing capacity for both public and active modes of transport should be maintained. (P 8-70)
- G. The method and logic used to develop and assess the Project is similar to methods that have delivered numerous motorways around Australia that have not only failed to ease congestion, but have made it significantly worse.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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: DAVID OPENSHAW  
 Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

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

Address: 43 HORDERN ST  
 Suburb: NEWTOWN NSW Postcode: 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- (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.

Name:..... Alison Jilly .....

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

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

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

Address:..... 4/117 Peter sham Rd .....

Suburb:..... m/ville ..... Postcode:..... 2204 .....

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

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

Name: ROSS MCKENZIE

Signature: Ross McKenzie

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: 13 ST MARYS ST

Suburb: CAMPBELL DOWN Postcode 2050

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

**A. 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.

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

**C. 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.**

**D. 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?**

**E. 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.**

**F. 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.**

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>R.V. ELLIS</u>	
	Address: <u>12 DADUNG STREET</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>BALMAIN</u>	Postcode <u>2041</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>R.V. Ellis</u>	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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

Submission to:

Name: Reka Zsotia Halasz

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

Signature: Reka

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

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

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

Application Number: SSI 7485

Address: 14 Rawson St

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
 Link

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

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

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>IPA TURNER</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>78 QUEEN ST</u>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <u>NEWTOWN</u>	Postcode
	Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

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 Davidson

Signature: M Davidson

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 Flood St

Suburb: Heidelberg NSW 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 Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- 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 \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Maria Davidson</u>	
	Address: <u>45 Flood St</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Heichhardt</u>	Postcode <u>2040</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>M Davidson</u>	
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**  
Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Name: Maria Davidson  
Signature: MDavidson Please  
include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT  
made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  
Address: 45 Flood St  
Suburb: Heidelberg NSW Postcode 2040

*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 this circumstances and call on the Government to investigate the 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 be 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.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Maria Davidson</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>MDavidson</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>45 Flood St</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Leichhardt NSW</u> Postcode: <u>2040</u>	

**I submit my objection** to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

- *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.*

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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 Davidson

Signature: MDavidson

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 Flood St

Suburb: Leichhardt NSW 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 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.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name:

WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Maria Davidson

Signature: M Davidson

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

Address: 45 Flood St

Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040

**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 where Fairy Wrens can be found because of the substantial bush cover. This is very important as where these birds are found nature tends to be in balance which is not the case in parks like Easton Park and Bicentennial Park.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>MARIA DAVIDSON</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>M Davidson</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>45 Flood St</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode: <u>2040</u>	

**I submit my objection** to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

- *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.*
- *Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects ?*
- *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.*
- *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 EIS acknowledges that extra construction traffic will add to travel times across the Inner West and have a negative impact on businesses in the area. No compensation is suggested. These impacts are not been taken into account of evaluating the cost of WestCONnex.*
- *The EIS lacks sufficient focus on traffic congestion in the suburbs of Alexandria and Erskineville. Are these being ignored because they will be even more congested than currently.*

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**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: Maria Davidson

Signature: MDavidson

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 Flood St

Suburb: Leichhardt NSW 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 Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- ❖ 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 for project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning  
Services,

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

Application Name:

WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

ROS HAGGETT

Signature:

*R Haggett*

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

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

Address:

23/5 PARNANT BRIDGE RD

Suburb:

MANAWANG

Postcode

2050

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Rob Haggerty</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>23/5 PYRAMONT BRIDGE RD</u> Suburb: <u>CAMPESOWN</u> Postcode <u>2250</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>R Haggerty</u>
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

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.*
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.*
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)*
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.*

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Rob Haggett</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>R. Haggett</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>23/5 Pyramus BRIDGE RD</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>CAMPERROWN</u> Postcode: <u>2156</u>	

**I submit my objection** to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects?
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 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.
7. 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.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details 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 \_\_\_\_\_

**Rob Haggett**

**robhaggett@gmail.com**

**Unit 23**

**5 Pyrmont Bridge Rd**

**Camperdown NSW 2050 Australia**

**Your view on the application: I object to it**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Extra comments

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Rob Haggett

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

MOMQUE ESPRITA

Signature:

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

Address:

502 King St.

Suburb:

Newtown

Postcode

2042

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

- 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.
- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.
- 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.
- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls

are used. The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

MONIQUE FSPRITH

Signature:

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

Address:

502 King Street

Suburb:

Newtown

Postcode


2042

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> <b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> <i>MONIQUE ESPERITY</i>
<b>Application Number: SSI 7485</b>	<b>Address:</b> <i>Soul Hairart, 502 King St.</i> <b>Suburb:</b> <i>Newtown</i> <b>Postcode</b> <del><i>220</i></del> <i>2042</i>
<b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b>	<b>Signature:</b> 
<p align="center">Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website  <b>Declaration: I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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

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

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~~ <sup>95</sup> 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:.....

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments


Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
 Link

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Jane Dune</u>
	Address: <u>16 wells St</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Newtown</u> Postcode <u>2042</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> 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:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>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.</p> <p>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/M5link project. Given this how is it possible to know or address the impacts of the M4/M5 Link, unless this is just yet more justification for yet more roads?</p> <p>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</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
|--|---|


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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>PATRICIA VAUGHAN</u>	
	Address: <u>25 PLEASANT AVE</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>ERSKINEVILLE</u>	Postcode <u>2043</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>PAV</u>	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

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

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

<p><b>Attention Director</b>  Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  Department of Planning and Environment  GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Rachel Miller</u></p> <p>Signature: <u></u></p> <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.  I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>19 Georgina St</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Newtown</u> Postcode: _____</p>
---	---

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 X 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: Rachel Miller

Signature: [Signature]

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

Address: 19 Georgina St

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

Submission to:


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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
 Link

- I. *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.*

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>CRAIG BOREHAM</u>
	Address: <u>108/88 KING ST.</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>NEWTOWN.</u> Postcode <u>2041</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> 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. The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.
- II. The social and economic impact study fails to record the great concern for valued Newtown heritage
- III. The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.
- IV. The consultants for the Social and Economic Impact study is HillPDA. This company has a conflict of interest and is not an appropriate choice to do a social impact study of WestCONnex. Amongst its services it offers property valuation services and promotes property development in what are perceived to be strategic locations. HillPDA were heavily involved in work leading to the development of Urban Growth NSW and the heavily criticised Parramatta Rd Study. It is not in the public interest to use public funds on an EIS done by a company that has such a heavy stake in property development opportunities along the Parramatta Rd corridor. One of the advantages of property development along Parramatta Rd that Hill PDA promotes on its website is the 33 kilometre WestCONnex.
- V. The EIS acknowledges that extra construction traffic will add to travel times across the Inner West and have a negative impact on businesses in the area. No compensation is suggested. These impacts are not been taken into account of evaluating the cost of WestCONnex.
- VI. The EIS acknowledges that 'rat running' by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.
- VII. The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.
- VIII. Table 6.1 in Appendix Q ( Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Theo van der Meer

Signature:



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

Address:

75 Nelson St

Suburb:

Annandale

Postcode

2038

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects?
5. 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.
6. I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Attention Director</b> <b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b>	<b>Name:</b> <i>N. Ketbey</i>
	<b>Address:</b> <i>14 Clark St</i>
<b>Application Number: SSI 7485</b>	<b>Suburb:</b> <i>Newtown</i> <b>Postcode:</b> <i>2042</i>
<b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b>	<b>Signature:</b> <i>[Signature]</i>
<p style="text-align: center;">Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website  <b>Declaration: I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment Application Number: SSI 7485 GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	From: Name: <i>James Dempster</i> Address: <i>117 Buckland Street</i>
Application Name: Westconnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <i>Alexandria</i> Postcode <i>2015</i>
Declaration : I <b>have not</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

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

- The NSW government stated that WestCONnex would NOT mean clearways for King St Newtown. Less than a week after the release of the EIS weekend clearways for King St have already been announced. I am completed 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

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: JOE CARRICK

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: 53 Reynolds

Suburb: Balmain 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

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

<b>Attention Director</b> Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>L. Blundell</u>
	Address: <u>81 Gardeners Rd</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Kingsford</u> Postcode <u>2032</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>L. Blundell</u>
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Ann Jones</i> Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: <i>5 HORDERN ST</i> Suburb: <i>NEWTOWN</i> Postcode <i>2042</i>


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

- 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 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 be 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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Michael Moore</i>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <i>2/10 Georgina st</i>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <i>Newtown</i>	Postcode <i>2042</i>
	Signature: 	
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration</b> : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

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

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

---

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>Attention Director</b>  Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  Department of Planning and Environment  GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Alexis Bransgrove</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>Bransgrove</u></p> <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.  I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>4/6-10 Mingrove Cres</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Forest Lodge</u> Postcode <u>2037</u></p>
---	--

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment Application Number: SSI 7485 GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	From: Name: <i>Hugo G. P. M. C. L. K.</i> Address: <i>Georgina St Newtown</i>
Application Name: Westconnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <i>Newtown</i> Postcode <i>2042</i>
Declaration : I <b>have not</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

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

- The planning for WestCONnex has been completely undemocratic. Independent evidence that tollways are not the solution to Sydney's Traffic Congestion has been ignored and instead the NSW government is wasting billions of public money.
- 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?
- 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.
- WestCONnex has chosen Darley Road as a dive site despite the fact that it is the third most dangerous traffic spot in the Inner West. They have ignored advice from an independent engineer that it is not suitable.
- The WestConnex Traffic model should not be confidential. It should immediately be released to Councils and the public so that it can be independently reviewed and tested.
- 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.
- I am opposed to even more destruction of heritage buildings in the Inner West. Already scores have been demolished in St Peters and Haberfield.
- 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.

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 \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Monikha . Anyal

Signature: 31a James St

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

Address: 31a James St

Suburb: Enmore Postcode 2042

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

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 \_\_\_\_\_

**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:

Latisha Yacoub

Signature:

[Signature]

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

Address:

217 Commercial rd

Suburb:

Vaseyard

Postcode

2168

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Eliot Salmon</i>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <i>19 Browns Ave</i>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <i>Enmore</i>	Postcode <i>2042</i>
	Signature: <i>Eliot Salmon</i>	
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Declaration :</b> I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

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

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

---

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>Attention Director</b>  Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  Department of Planning and Environment  GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Megan Walsh</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>Megan Walsh</u></p> <p>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.  I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>50 Mann Road</u> <u>Apt. 8</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Queenscliff</u> Postcode <u>2096</u></p>
---	---

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 \_\_\_\_\_

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Maryanne Lià</u> Signature: <u>M Lià</u>
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: <u>12 Susan St.</u> Suburb: <u>NEWTOWN</u> Postcode: <u>2042.</u>

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name:..... <i>JENNIFER BASKER</i> .....	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature:..... <i>[Signature]</i> .....	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <i>23 LAWSON ST</i> .....	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <i>BALMAIN</i> ..... Postcode: <i>2041</i> .....	

**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**

- o *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.*
- o *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.*
- o *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)*
- o *Insufficient time has been given for the community to prepare submissions to the EIS, especially when one considers that whole neighbourhoods affected by the project were not even notified during the concept design period. e.g Newtown, east of King St.*
- o *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.*

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: <u>Brandon Denning</u>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature: <u>Brandon Denning</u>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: <b>I HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>55 Morayson Dr</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>Lunn</u> Postcode: <u>2170</u>	

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

- I 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 \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>Attention Director</b>  Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  Department of Planning and Environment  GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Kate Kennedy</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>Cathere Kennedy</u></p> <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.  I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>29 Bruner St</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Erskineville</u> Postcode <u>2043</u></p>
---	--

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

- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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)
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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 \_\_\_\_\_