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

Name: Cecilia Greatbatch

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 Albert ST

Suburb: Ersuneville 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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

⇒ 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective.

⇒ Recently Andrew Constance has been quoted numerous times promoting his vision of the transport future and some of these views are aired in the EIS but the vision put forward is highly visionary with no practical detail addressing how these changes are going to be brought about and so they are totally unrealistic. For example it is starting to be commonly accepted that car manufacturers will be reducing production of petrol/diesel cars before 2040 probably starting in 2030. It is proposed that electric cars will then take over. It is suggested that cars will be charged 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!

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

⇒ Worker parking – Leichhardt. There is provision in the EIS for only a dozen worker car parks and no provision for the 100 or so workers who will be permanently based at the Darley Road site for up to five years. A major construction site project should not be permitted in a neighbourhood area without allocated parking for all workers. No other business would be permitted to be established without this requirement being satisfied – why is it acceptable for this project? In addition, the EIS proposes the removal of 20 car spaces used by residents on Darley Road and will remove the 'kiss and ride' facility at the light rail stop. This will result in residents being unable to park in their own street and will increase noise impacts from workers doing shift changeovers 24 hours a day.

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I 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: Alexa Tran

Signature:

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

Address: 49 Stanmore rd Stanmore

Suburb: ..... Postcode: 2048

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

(1) Flooding – Leichhardt. Darley Road and adjacent streets such as Hubert St are exposed to flood. The flood impact could be exacerbated by the disruption or blockage of existing drainage networks, which are risks identified in the EIS. The EIS has not assessed whether the identified risk to the existing drainage network will cause increased risk of flood damage to flood lots and it fails to take account of the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan which contains recommended flood modification options. The EIS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM3 to lay additional pipes/culverts from Elswick Street to Hawthorne Canal (via Regent Street and Darley Road). RMS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM4 to lay additional pipes/ culverts from William Street to Hawthorne Canal via Hubert Street and Darley Road. The EIS should not be approved as it has not properly explained or assessed these impacts.

(2) The substation and water treatment plant should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link. This will mean that the site is less visible to residents and most pedestrian access is at this end. There are no homes that will have direct line of site of the facility if it is moved. This will also enable direct pedestrian access to the light rail without the need to use the winding path at the rear of the site which creates safety issues and adds to the time required to access the light rail stop.

(3) 1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

(4) I oppose the destruction of any more of Sydney's heritage for WestCONnex. I am appalled that Sydney Motorway Corporation is seeking approval to tunnel under hundreds of highly valued heritage buildings in Newtown without any serious assessment of risk at all. This heritage belongs to all of Sydney.

(5) I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.

(6) The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.

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

Name Alexa Email Katran10@hotmail.com Mobile 0430082660

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: Sandra Hackaby

Signature: S J Hackaby

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: 68 Fourcroft St

Suburb: Rozelle Postcode 2039

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

- The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. It relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.

- 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 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.

- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downplays concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. The raises the question of whether this is a result of the failure of SMC to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters about the potential impacts of the M4 M5

- Many homes around the Rozelle Rail Yards and the Crescent Civil site will be noise affected, some will be highly noise affected. The expected duration of the cumulative works is 120 weeks, almost 3 years, when noise impact will be significant so it is essential that maximum noise mitigation measures are put in place. However the EIS contains only vague details of how mitigation will be carried out. There is no requirement that measures will in fact be carried out to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain specific noise mitigation measures, that can be mandated and enforced. Areas that will be particularly highly noise affected are Bayview Crescent and Railway Parade, the Northern end of Rail Yard site and sections of Lilyfield Rd, Hornsey St, Quirk St and Robert St. Given their proximity, receivers located along Lilyfield Rd between Victoria Road and Gordon St which overlook the Rozelle Yards are likely to experience the greatest construction noise impact within the whole Rozelle area.

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	**Name:** B. WOODS **Signature:**
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	*Please ~~Include~~ my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration*** *: I* ***HAVE NOT*** *made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*
Application Number: SSI 7485 **Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link**	**Address:** 13 GROVE ST **Suburb:** BIRCHGROVE **Postcode** 2041

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

I. **The EIS does not provide appropriate parking for the estimated 100 or so workers that the EIS states will work every day at the site, while other equivalent sites have allocated parking for such workers (Northcote Civil site (150)) and Parramatta Road East Civil site (140). It is also noted that the EIS provides for loss of 20 residential parks on Darley Road. Local streets are at capacity already because of the lack of off-street parking for many residents and the Light Rail stop which means that commuters use local streets. The EIS states that workers 'will be encouraged to use public transport.' the EIS needs to mandate that no trucks or construction vehicles are to park in local streets. There needs to be a requirement that is enforceable that workers use the Light Rail stop which is adjacent to the site or a plan to bus in workers**

II. **The EIS does not require an acoustic shed and states that 'Acoustic barriers and devices at the access tunnel entrances would be considered and implemented where reasonable and feasible to minimise potential noise impacts associated with out-of-hours works within the tunnels.'**

III. **The EIS contains no detail of the access tunnel from the Darley Road site to the mainline tunnel other than depicting the route. The approval conditions need to ensure that tunnelling is occurring at sufficient depth so as to not jeopardise the integrity of the homes and not create unacceptable vibration and noise impacts for James Street residents and those at adjacent streets. The approval conditions need to make clear the period of time for which the 'temporary' tunnel is to be used.**

IV. **The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)**

V. **The EIS social an economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestCONnex has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.**

VI. **Light construction vehicle routes – the EIS acknowledges that these vehicles will use 'dispersed' routes (8-62). In other words, construction vehicles will use and park on local roads. The EIS does not propose any management as to which roads they use. The addition of 70-100 light vehicle movements day in Leichhardt will result in our small, congested streets, which are already at capacity and suffering parking shortages, will have the added impact of workers travelling to and from the site and parking in local streets. There will be rat running. The EIS should provide an agreed route (using arterial roads only) that can be used by all vehicles associated with the project.**

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

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

Name: Anne Picot

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: 57 Hutchinson St

Suburb: St Peters Postcode 2044

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- This EIS provides no basis on which to approve such a complex project including the building of interchanges underneath Sydney suburbs Rozelle and Leichhardt. It would be absurd to approve the building of up to three tunnels under people's homes on the basis of such flimsy information.

- The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it.This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement

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

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

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

- Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates and unacceptable risk of damage to homes due to settlement (ground movement). The EIS acknowledges that at tunnelling at 35 metres and less this is a real risk. There is no mitigation provided for this risk. Instead, it states that properties will be repaired at the Government's expense. However no details or assurance as to how this will occur are provided. The project should not be approved with such tunnelling depths permitted and with no detail as to the extent of damage and how and when it will be repaired. It will lead to the situation where residents and businesses are forced to engage structural engineers and lawyers to prove that the damage was linked to Westconnex works, with no assurance that this property damage will be promptly and satisfactorily fixed.

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

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

Name: ENIS JUSCISPATHIC

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: 1 WALKER AVE

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

I. Permanent water treatment plant and substation – Leichhardt The proposal to locate this permanent structure in a residential setting is opposed. The site will have a negative visual impact on the area and is in direct line of sight of a number of homes. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site further from homes.

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

III. The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.

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

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

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

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: ROHAN STORY

Signature: Rohan Story

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: 75 CHARLES 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 EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. It relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.

- 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 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.

- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downplays concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. The raises the question of whether this is a result of the failure of SMC to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters about the potential impacts of the M4 M5

- Many homes around the Rozelle Rail Yards and the Crescent Civil site will be noise affected, some will be highly noise affected. The expected duration of the cumulative works is 120 weeks, almost 3 years, when noise impact will be significant so it is essential that maximum noise mitigation measures are put in place. However the EIS contains only vague details of how mitigation will be carried out. There is no requirement that measures will in fact be carried out to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain specific noise mitigation measures, that can be mandated and enforced. Areas that will be particularly highly noise affected are Bayview Crescent and Railway Parade, the Northern end of Rail Yard site and sections of Lilyfield Rd, Hornsey St, Quirk St and Robert St. Given their proximity, receivers located along Lilyfield Rd between Victoria Road and Gordon St which overlook the Rozelle Yards are likely to experience the greatest construction noise impact within the whole Rozelle area.

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

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

Name:.....

Signature:.....

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

Address:.....

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

a. I am concerned that SMC has selected one of Sydney's most dangerous traffic spots, Darley Rd in Leichhardt for a construction site that will bring hundreds of extra trucks and cars into the area on a daily basis for years.

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

c. Darley Road is confirmed as a 'civil and tunnel site (dive site) with a 'Motorway Operations' site at one end for machinery during the build and will then house permanent water treatment facilities, despite evidence tendered to the Concept Design explaining that this intersection has an high accident rate and is completely unsuitable for such a purpose.

d. The traffic around St Peters expected to be heavier because of the increased road access to the new Interchange will adversely affect our community because moving around to our parks and to the shops, to the buses and to the train stations, for pedestrians and cars, will be more difficult. Our community is being sacrificed for the marginal improvement in traffic movement elsewhere in Sydney. No measures to amclioratc thc impact arc mcntioncd. This is unacceptable.

e. The EIS does not provide any opportunity to comment on the urban design and landscape component of the project. It states that 'a detailed review and finalisation of the architectural treatment of the project operational infrastructure would be undertaken 'during detailed design'. The Community should be given an opportunity to comment upon and influence the design and we object to the approval of the EIS on the basis that this detail is not provided, nor is the community (or other stakeholders) given an opportunity to comment or influence the final design.

f. The latest EIS was released just ten business days after feedback period ended for the Concept Design for the M4/M5 and before preliminary drilling to establish a route through the Inner West is completed. WHAT IS THE RUSH? This EIS is little more than a concept design and is far less developed than earlier ones. It is composed of many indicate only plans such that it is impossible to know what the impacts will be and yet approval is being sought in a rush. The EIS ignores more than 1500 submissions, including one of 142 pages from the Inner West Council.

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

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

i. I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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:* Rebecca Priem *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:* 10 Lambert St *Suburb:* Gabinevale *Postcode* 2043

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

- 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

- 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

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

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

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

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** Tanya George.
	Address: 21 Riversdale ave
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** Kiama Downs **Postcode** 2533
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:**
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

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

i. 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.

ii. There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

iii. 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

iv. 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

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

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: G Michelakis

Signature: G Michelakis

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: 69 Metropolitan Rd

Suburb: Enmore *Postcode* 2042

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

- The EIS needs to require that all workers are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads at the Darley Road site. This is justified because the site provides 11 car 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 EIS uses maps indicating alignment of the mainline tunnels. It is clear from more detailed reading deep into the EIS (ie 12-57 Sydney Water Tunnels) that the alignment and depths of the tunnels may vary very significantly, after further survey work has been done and construction methodology determined by the construction contractor. The maps provided in the EIS are nothing more than 'indicative' and are misleading the community. The EIS should be withdrawn, corrected and updated, and reissued for genuine public comment based on 'definitive' information.

- The EIS proposes that all trucks will arrive at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site from Haberfield and travel along Darley Road to the site, with a right-hand turn now permitted into James Street. The proposed route will result in a truck every 3-4 minutes for 5 years running directly by the small houses on Darley Road. These homes will not be habitable during the five-year construction period due to the unacceptable noise impacts. The truck noise will be worsened by their need to travel up a steep hill to return to the City West Link, so the noise impacts will affect not just those homes on or immediately adjacent to Darley Road.

- Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.

- The Darley Road site will not be returned after the project, with a substantial portion permanently housing a Motorways Operations facility which involves a substation and water treatment plant. This means that the residents will not be able to directly access the North Light rail Station from Darley Road but will have to traverse Canal Road and use the narrow path from the side. In addition the presence of this facility reduces the utility of this vital land which could be turned into a community facility. Over the past 12 months community representatives were repeatedly told that the land would be returned and this has not occurred. We also object to the location of this type of infrastructure in a neighbourhood setting.

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

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Nicola Dickson Signature: N Dickson
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: 8 Story Pl Suburb: Isaacs Postcode 2607

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: Danny El Sawalhi Signature: D. Sawalhi *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: Unit 5/346 Illawarra Rd Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2204	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
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: Herbert James Morcome

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: 407 Marrickville Rd

Suburb: *Postcode*

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

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

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

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

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

v. *I oppose the removal of further homes of Significance in either Haberfield or Ashfield. The level of destruction has already been appalling. Residents were led to expect that there would be no further construction impacts after the completion of the M4 East. The loss of further houses of the community will cause further distress within this community.*

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

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

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Bill MERLO
	Address: 227 Wilson ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Newtown Postcode 2042
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

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

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.

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.

D. 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.

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.

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

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.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Carolina Espínola.
	Address: 1/1 Fabos Pl. 8
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Croydon Park Postcode 2133.
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

- Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.

- Why are two different options being suggested for Haberfield? It is clear that both of these are unacceptable and will expose residents to unnecessary traffic danger, congestion and disruption with capacity to enjoy their homes and environment. It is insulting that the EIS acknowledges this but offers not solution other than to go ahead.

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

- The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.

- Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.

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

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

- A lot of work has gone into building cycling and pedestrian routes in Rozelle and Annandale. Interference and disruption of routes for four years is not a 'temporary' imposition.

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Carolina Espinola Address: 1/1 Fabb Pl.
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: CROYDON PARK Postcode 2133
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

- 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

- 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. 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: Caren McAuliffe

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: 56 Great Buckingham St

Suburb: Redfern *Postcode* 2016

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

i. The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.

ii. In Leichhardt serious safety concerns about the choice of the Darley Rd site have been raised by the Inner West Council and an independent engineer's report. Despite countless meetings between local residents and SMC and RMS over 12 months, none of the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents have even been acknowledged. This is a massive breach of community trust and seriously questions the integrity of the EIS.

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

iv. It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.

v. The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. It relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.

vi. EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.

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:* Nicholas Fonseca *Signature:* N Fons *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:* 48 Stafford St. *Suburb:* Stanmore NSW *Postcode* 2048

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

a) The USA, UK and European states are more and more concerned about the bad effects of car emissions on people's health and are taking steps to tougher emission standards. Here the state government is promoting car use at the expense of public health concerns. I object to the WestConnex project because of the increased car emissions it will cause.

b) The removal of spoil at the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to the largest amount of Spoil truck movements on the entire Stage 3 project: 517 Heavy truck movements a day, of which 46 are stated to take place at Peak hours. There will also be 10 Heavy truck movements a day from the Crescent Civil Site. The sheer number of trucks on the road will lead to massive increases in congestion. Maps in the EIS have the spoil trucks going to and from these sites from the Haberfield direction on the City West Link. This is also the direction that is being proposed for spoil truck movements from Darley Rd which is said to have 100 Heavy truck movements a day. It is stated that the cumulative effect of truck movements from all sites on the City West Link will be 700 (one way) Heavy truck movements a day and of that 208 will be in Peak hours. This plan totally lacks credibility.

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

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

e) The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street will greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased by the time Stage 3 is completed. It states that Stage 3 will do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at Peak times. This will be highly negative for the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through the local areas on local streets.

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

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

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: 610/160 Goulburn St

Suburb: Surry Hills *Postcode* 2010

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

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

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.

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.

D. 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.

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.

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

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.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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: David Laws
	Address: 32 Abercrombie St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Darlington Postcode 2008
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

- The EIS lacks sufficient focus on traffic congestion in the suburbs of Alexandria and Erskineville. Are these being ignored because they will be even more congested than currently.

- The EIS states that, if the current proposal for ventilation facilities do not manage to achieve satisfactory environmental and health impacts, that further ventilation facilities may be proposed. This is unacceptable and the EIS does not provide the alternative locations for any such facilities and therefore the community is deprived of any opportunity to comment on their impacts. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be additional ventilation facilities that are not disclosed in the EIS.

- It is clear that the tunnel portals will be major sites for more traffic congestion. Some intersections that are currently very congested will be just as bad in 2033.

- The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' Therefore this entire process is a sham as the extent to which concerns are taken into account is not known as the contractor can simply make further changes. As the contractor is not bound to take into account community impacts outside of the strict requirements and as the contractor will be trying to deliver the project as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is likely that the additional measure proposed with respect to construction noise mitigation for (example) will not be adopted. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS is riddled with caveats and lacks clear obligations and requirements fn project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail.

- 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.

- 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.

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

Signature: David Edwards

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

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

Address: 3/6 Dover St

Suburb: Glenview Nsw Postcode 2130

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 accuracy of the traffic modelling outputs can only be as good as the accuracy of the inputs. Projections of key inputs relating to population and employment become very unreliable beyond 10 or 15 years. In addition to this, the transport sector is facing a potentially significant disruption from connected, automated vehicles that may have a significant impact on traffic growth. This has not been considered or modelled.

- Because the strategic model does not limit the volume on road links and at intersection to their ceiling capacity; it cannot (and was not designed to) be used precisely as it is. A mesoscopic model, which can provide more a far greater level of detail than the strategic model used would have ensured a more thorough analysis of the networks' ability to cope with the traffic predicted.

- The EIS admits that impacts of construction of the M4-M5 Link will worsen traffic on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it is outrageous for motorists to be asked already to pay up to up to $20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.

- The EIS focusses on the impact of construction traffic during commuter peak-hours. Given the EIS notes that construction-related vehicles will be limited during peak-hours, information should be provided on the impact of construction-related vehicles when both traffic volumes are higher – in particular during weekday lunch peak and Saturday lunch peak for sites like the Pyrmont Bridge Road Tunnel Site where operations are proposed 24/7. (Tables 8-46, 8-47, 8-48, 8-51, 8-52, 8-53).

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

- The EIS does not require an acoustic shed and states that 'Acoustic barriers and devices at the access tunnel entrances would be considered and implemented where reasonable and feasible to minimise potential noise impacts associated with out-of-hours works within the tunnels.'

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

Name _____ **Email** _____ **Mobile** _____

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** Katerina Allport
	Address: 4/65-67 Crystal St
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** Petersham **Postcode** 2049
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:**
Please Include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

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

- The 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 _____

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

Name: Anna Stephens

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: 213 Addison Rd

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

- Given that the modelling for air quality is based on the traffic modelling, which, as shown above, is fundamentally flawed, and given poor air quality has a significant health impact the EIS should not be approved until an independent scientifically qualified reviewer has analysed the stated air quality outcomes and identified any deficits

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

- Part 3 of the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements requires assessment of the likely risks of the project to public safety, paying particular attention to pedestrian safety. This is not addressed in Chapter 8.

- The EIS admits that the people who live in western Sydney have lower incomes than in the inner suburbs and that the tolls will therefore be a heavier cost in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, Blacktown or Wetherill Park than in Strathfield or Padstow. This is unfair when the benefits of Stage 3 are all for north-south connections to the northern beaches or the proposed new harbour tunnel.

- The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. We now have the proposals for Stages 1,2 and 3 and they don't even go to Port Botany or Sydney Airport. We are being asked to support Stage 3 of WestConnex on the basis of more major unfunded projects that are barely sketches on a map.

- The EIS provides traffic projections for the 'With Project' scenario and 'cumulative' scenario (which in addition to links in the 'With Project' scenario includes the Beaches Link and F6 motorway connections), but when referencing the traffic benefits/impacts in the early sections, the EIS appears to cite the 'with project' scenario rather than Cumulative Scenario. It is unclear which scenarios the Business Case best reflects.

- We know the state government intends to sell the project, both the constructing and the operation. I object to the privatization of the road system. There is no guarantee of protecting the public interest in an efficient transport system when so much of it operates to make a profit for shareholders.

- The modelling makes no mention of bus lanes on Victoria Rd. If these lanes were not modelled as car lanes the assumed capacity of the road is incorrect.

- The modelling shows severe degradation to the City West Link if the Western Harbour Tunnel is connected.

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

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

Name: Jane St V. Jelf

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: 42 TERMINUS 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

1. Alternative access route for trucks – Leichhardt: The EIS states that there are 'investigations' occurring into alternative access to the Darley Road site. The EIS does not provide any detail on which residents can comment about alternative access which would keep trucks off Darley Road. The plans for alternative access should be expedited. It should be a condition of approval that the alternative access is confirmed and that no spoil trucks are permitted to access Darley Road due to the unacceptable noise, safety and traffic issues that the current proposal creates

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

3. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1,000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity.

4. Where is the commitment to community consultation and to long term planning when the EIS for the M4/M5 Link is released before any response to the extensive community feedback on the M4-M5 Link concept design could possibly have been seriously considered. This demonstrates deep government contempt for the people of NSW and the communities of the Inner West of Sydney in particular.

5. The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.

6. There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.

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

Name _____ **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: Kathleen Hossack

Signature: Kathleen Hossack

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 James 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

i. The EIS admits that drivers from lower income households are more likely to travel longer distances to avoid tolls because of the cost. So you either pay the high tolls (capped at $7.95 in 2015 dollars) or you drive for longer to avoid the tolls. We have seen this already where commuters have chose to drive on Parramatta rd not the new M4 with the new tolls. This is unfair.

ii. In order to make the model work, traffic that exceeds the free flow capacity of the network was reassigned to hours outside of the peak – i.e. the model assumes people shift the time they travel. However, the potential of shifting journey times to reduce overall traffic demand is not considered.

iii. The traffic modelling approach applied in the EIS is commonly used in NSW. This approach has proven to be flawed. Infrastructure Australia compared predicted and actual traffic levels and found that the assumed steady growth in traffic did not occur. In Sydney, urban congestion levels are growing at around one third of the forecast rate. (See Figure 1, below)

iv. SMC is using an unpublished Value of Travel Time in the Westconnex traffic modelling. If the Value of Travel Time adopted is incorrect, then all outputs will be incorrect.

v. The construction impact of the future Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link entry and exit ramps connecting to City West Link/The Crescent has been assessed. The operational traffic impact of these ramps has not. This should be completed and publicly released before determination. There is no verifiable or understandable data to determine the veracity of claims of traffic generated by these other links.

vi. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1,000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity. I object to the push for the M4-M5 link when there are still no plans for the Sydney Gateway to deal with the increased traffic.

vii. The EIS states that a Construction Traffic and Access Management Plan (CTAMP) "would be developed in consultation with local Councils and stakeholders associated with public facilities adjacent to project site". A similar commitment was made for construction of the New M5. It has been poorly managed. There is limited response to Council input and the Sydney Motorway Corporation and Roads and Maritime Services each deny responsibility and blame each other for a lack of action.

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

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

Name: Lachlan Gray

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: 24 Manton Ave

Suburb: Newington Postcode: 2127

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.**

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

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: 418 King St

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* _____

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** Ben Harris **Address:** 122 Burdett St
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** Wahroonga **Postcode** 2076
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:**
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

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

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

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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:** Jane Dunne
	Address: 16 Wells St
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** Newtown **Postcode** 2042
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:**
Please Include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

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

- The 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 _____

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: Alejandro Saavedra

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: 26a Rosemead Rd

Suburb: Hornsby Postcode 2077

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- 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.

- 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."

- 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.

- 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.

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

Name: Caroline Anderson

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: 113 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

- The EIS admits that the increased traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange will impact on bus running times especially in the evening peak hour and increase the time taken (2.5 minutes, which seems optimistic). The 422 bus and associated cross city services which use the Princes Highway are notorious for irregular running times because of the congestion on the Princes highway and cross roads, so an admitted worsening of the running time will adversely impact the people who are dependent on the buses. This will be compounded by the loss of train services at St Peters station while it is closed for the Sydney Metro build and then subsequently when it re-opens. In all the impact of the new M5 and the M4-M5 link is to worsen access to public transport significantly for the residents of the St Peters neighbourhood.

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

- One toll road leads to another 3 being proposed. The EIS's for the M4 East and the New M5 argued the case that serious congestion created near interchanges would be solved once the M4/M5 was built. Now it seems this is not the case and more roads will be needed to relieve the congestion – WHERE DOES THIS END? According to the M4/M5 EIS the real benefits will depend on building the Western Harbour Tunnel, the Airport Link and a tollway heading South. None of these projects have been planned, let alone approved but yet are part of addressing the congestion impacts acknowledged for the M4/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?

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

- The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1,000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity.

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

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: Anna Keohan Signature: AKeohan *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: 43 Victoria Rd Suburb: Marrickville Postcode 2204

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).

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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: L ROSE Address: 1/267-269 BALMAIN RD
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. **Acquisition and demolition 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. It is also wasteful that several million dollars was spent on renovations, for the entire structure to de demolished less than 18 months later.
2. **Night works – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that to minimize disruptions to traffic on the existing road network (including in peak hours) there will be night works where appropriate. Given the congested nature of Darley Road, it is likely there will be frequent night work (EIS, 6.4). This will create an unacceptable impact in residents. It is unacceptable that a highly unsuitable site has been selected. And, instead of a proper plan to manage traffic, the EIS contemplate work simply occurring at night. This is objected to in the strongest terms.
3. **Additional facilities.** The EIS states that the contractor may decide upon additional 'construction ancillary facilities' to the 12 identified in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be more unidentified sites taken, as residents will have no opportunity to comment on their impacts. The approval condition should limit any construction facilities to those already notified and detailed in the EIS.
4. **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.
5. **Noise mitigation – Leichhardt.** The noise mitigation proposed in the EIS is unacceptable. No detail of noise walls is provided, giving residents no opportunity to comment on whether final impacts are acceptable. This is despite the fact 36 homes are identified in the EIS as severely affected by construction noise. The acoustic shed proposed is of the lowest grade and does not cover the entire site, resulting in noise impacts from the movement of trucks in and out of the tunnel access point. The highest grade acoustic shed should be provided, with the shed covering the entire site. The additional noise mitigation such as noise walls, need to be set out in detail so that residents can properly comment on the impacts.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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: Ben Brown Address: 67 Francis Street
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 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 of 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.
3. The impacts in the EIS are misleading because they do not include any detail of the cumulative impact caused by the overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 (of up to one year). 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 multiple WestConnex projects. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure. Nor does the EIS provide for any traffic management to prevent rat running during the period of construction, when Stages 1 and 2 have opened. The EIS should not be approved without this detail and adequate plans to manage this impact.
4. 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)
5. The EIS states that all vegetation on the Darley Road site will be removed. This includes a mature large tree which provides a visual and noise barrier from the City West Link. The tree should not be permitted to be removed.
6. Despite the fact the EIS identifies over 30 homes with severe noise impacts, no mitigation is mandated. While the possibility of noise walls is flagged, along with in-home treatments, none of this is a requirement. Nor is any detail provided on which residents or business owners can comment. No noise barriers have been proposed. This is unacceptable and appropriate noise barriers should be included in the EIS for consideration. (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 _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Ben Brown
	Address: 67 Francis St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. 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 _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Ben Brown
	Address: 67 Francis St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. I object to the planned acquisition of the Dan Murphys site on Darley Road for the creation of a civil and tunnel works site.
2. The Darley Road site has many issues which make tunneling at this point an unacceptable risk, including that it is in a flood zone. This proposal will worsen the existing flooding risk. The mitigation suggested in the EIS is not adequate.
3. The EIS states that property damage will occur due to ground movement may occur. The EIS states that 'settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment'. The proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres.
4. The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This approach deprives residents of any ability to comment on the detailed designs. (Executive Summary xvi)
5. The EIS does not mention the impact of aircraft noise and its cumulative impact. Therefore, noise levels identified in the EIS are misleading. The EIS states there will be at least 10 weeks of severe noise impacts during the time that Dan Murphys is demolished and the road prepared. I object to the selection of the Darley Road site because of the unacceptable noise impacts it will have on surrounding homes and businesses, with at least 36 homes identified as suffering extreme noise interference for this initial 10-week period.
6. The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the Darley Road site which includes several mature trees. I object to the removal of these trees which create a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the trees are removed they must be replaced with mature trees as soon as the remediation of the site commences.
7. There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be safe. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.
8. 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 to be located on this site.

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

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Ben Brown Address: 67 Francis St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. I object to the selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.

2. The period of construction proposed is unacceptably long. Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years while the EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This period creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.

3. The noise impacts of construction are not able to be mitigated to an acceptable level and the EIS should not be approved on this basis. The EIS states 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.

4. No truck movements should be permitted on Darley Rd or any local roads in Leichhardt or adjoining suburbs. 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 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. I object to the selection of the Darley Rd site altogether, but propose this alternative, which appears to represent the least worst impact, should be chosen if this site is to be used.

5. I object to the number of truck movements proposed at the Darley Road site. The EIS states that there will be 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, as is currently provided.

6. 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 and provide a plan for enforcement (to be paid for my SMC and not by 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 Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Ben Brown Address: 67 Francis St,
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. I object to the selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.

2. I object to the proposal that 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day will occur at this site. This will create an unacceptable risk to pedestrians and bicycle users. The EIS should not permit any truck movements near the Darley Road site. The alternative proposal which provides that all spoil trucks enter and leave from the City West link is the only proposal that should be considered. The EIS does not mention that 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.

3. I object to the location of a permanent substation and water treatment plant following the completion of the project on the Darley Road site. This will limit the future uses of the land and the community has been continually assured that the land, which is Government-owned, would be available for community purposes. The presence of this facility will forever prevent the ability for safe and direct pedestrian access to the light rail stop, with users required to walk down a dark and winding path. It will also limit the future use of the site. If a permanent facility is to be located then it should be moved to the north of the site so that it is out of sight of homes and has less visual impact on residents.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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 _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: JEAN KAY 23/9/17 Signature: Jean Kay *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: 29/60 Wrights Rd. Suburb: Drummoyne Postcode 2047	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.**

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

b) One of the main reasons for establishing Buruwan Park was as a relatively quiet nature corridor for wildlife not for successions of children's parties so the assessment of this area in the EIS is entirely blinkered and inaccurate. The Rozelle Rail Yards site that may appear to development driven planners as an unattractive and wasted eyesore is ironically a very important nature reserve. It is perhaps the only area in the Annandale/Glebe area were Fairy Wrens can be found because of the substantial bush cover. This is very important as where these birds are found nature tends to be in balance which is not the case in parks like Easton Park and Bicentennial Park.

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

d) All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street) should have a strict prohibition on any truck movements and worker contractor parking. These homes are already suffering the worst construction impacts of the work on the site and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and additional noise impacts. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all of these streets.

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: JEAN GRAY

Signature: Jean Gray

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

Address: 29/60 Wrights Rd.

Suburb: Drummoyne *Postcode* 2047

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

- *The heritage impacts of WestCONnex Stage 3 need to be seen in the light of the appalling wholesale destruction that has already taken place in St Peters and Haberfield. Scores of houses and industrial buildings were torn down for tollways that will not solve traffic congestions. Always the cost of destruction is undervalued and the benefits of WestCONnex promoted. Whenever WestCONnex wants to tear down buildings or put them at risk it is backed by the EIS evaluation. This is not objective and it is not in the public interest.*

- *I object strongly to AECOM's approach to heritage. The methodology used is simply to describe heritage. If it interrupts the project plans, it simply must be destroyed. This is not an assessment at all. Plans to salvage items do have value but this value should not be used as a carrot to justify the removal of buildings.*

- *The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park, Rozelle, due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.*

- *There has never been any proper assessment of the cumulative impacts on heritage of the WestCONnex project. The loss of heritage in Concord, Haberfield and St Peters has been on a large scale and now the Stage 3 EIS shows that the M$/M5 tunnel would further add to this loss.*

- *Heritage items - Camperdown. The EIS also acknowledges that the use of a rock-breaker at the outer extents of the project footprint will affect 73 residences, with five heritage items identified as having the potential to be within the 'minimum safe working distance'. While some mitigation 'considered', it is not mandated and the requirement to mitigate is limited to 'where feasible and reasonable'. The mitigation proposed seems in any event to comprise letter-boxing residents about the likely impacts! The protection of heritage items should be mandated, not just considered and there should be a strict requirement to protect such heritage items.*

- *I object to the assessment of the removal of buildings, other rail infrastructure and vegetation on the Rozelle Railway Yards being done in advance of this EIS. The RMS environmental assessment process is not publicly accountable. These works were part of the WestConnex project and should have been assessed as part of Stage 3.*

23/7/19

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:** JEAN HAY. **Signature:** Jean C Hay. ***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:** 29/60 Wrights Rd **Suburb:** Drummoyne **Postcode** 2047

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

23/9/17

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

b) **The Rozelle Rail Yards are a totally inappropriate area to create a new recreational area because the area will be highly polluted by unfiltered Pollution Stacks and Tunnel Portals. In the EIS it is referred to as an idealized area."It is envisaged that the quantum of active recreation within the Rozelle Rail Yards would be further developed by others as projects such as The Bays Precinct are developed. The concept plan provides spaces that could include an array of active recreation opportunities and even community facilities such as gardens or a school." The suggestion that this would be a suitable location for a School is just beyond belief and demonstrates that those who have put these plans together are either staggeringly ignorant or totally delusional! At a time when major World cities are doing all they can to address the dire problems of pollution this is an appalling suggestion that is totally out of touch.**

c) **There are two areas in the Rozelle Rail Yards site where construction will be by cut and cover. These are the Portals for the Western Harbour Tunnel and the Portals for the M4/M5 link. This is of particular concern in the light of residents experiences in areas of Haberfield and St Peters where highly contaminated land areas were being disturbed. There was totally inadequate control of dust in these areas, where the dust would have been loaded with toxic chemical particulates. The old Rail Yards are highly contaminated land from their past use. The EIS gives no specific details of how this highly toxic threat is going to be securely managed. It is not acceptable for this to be decided only when the Construction Contracts have been issued, when the community will have no say or control over the methodology to be employed for removing vast amounts of contaminated spoil.**

d) **I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.**

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: JEAN HAY

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: 29/60 WRIGHTS RD

Suburb: DRUMMOYNE *Postcode* 2047

23/9/17

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

1. The EIS acknowledges that visual impacts will occur during construction. However it does not propose to address these negative impacts in the design of the project. This is unacceptable and the EIS needs to propose walls,, plant and perimeter treatments and other measures at appropriate locations to lessen the impact on visual amenity. (Executive Summary xviii)

2. It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?

3. This EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain – and is certainly not included here.

4. Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex and the government is seeking approval, yet there are no detailed construction plans so we are not speaking to a real situation.

5. The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.

6. Motor vehicles account for 14% of Particulate Pollution of 2.5 microns and less in Australia. There is no safe level to exposure to particulate matter of 2.5 microns and less. Particulate matter is linked with Asthma, Lung Disease, Cancer and Stroke.

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

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

...signs - My details must be

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

Name: JEAN HAY

Signature: Jean Hay 23/9/17

*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: 29/60 Wrights Rd.

Suburb: Drummoyne Postcode 2047

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

a) 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.

b) 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.

c) 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.

d) The removal of spoil at the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to the largest amount of Spoil truck movements on the entire Stage 3 project: 517 Heavy truck movements a day, of which 46 are stated to take place at Peak hours. There will also be 10 Heavy truck movements a day from the Crescent Civil Site. The sheer number of trucks on the road will lead to massive increases in congestion. Maps in the EIS have the spoil trucks going to and from these sites from the Haberfield direction on the City West Link. This is also the direction that is being proposed for spoil truck movements from Darley Rd which is said to have 100 Heavy truck movements a day. It is stated that the cumulative effect of truck movements from all sites on the City West Link will be 700 (one way) Heavy truck movements a day and of that 208 will be in Peak hours. This plan totally lacks credibility.

[redacted] anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details [redacted] not be divulged to

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:* JEAN HALEY. *Signature:* Jean Haley *Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.* *I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* *Address:* 29/60 Wrights Rd. *Suburb:* Drummoyne *Postcode* 2047

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons: 23/9/17

A. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. We now have proposals for Stages 1,2 and 3 and none achieve this goal. The community is asked to support this proposal on the basis of other major unfunded projects, which are little more than ideas on a map. This is NOT the way to plan a liveable city

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

C. The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' Therefore this entire process is a sham as the extent to which concerns are taken into account is not known as the contractor can simply make further changes. As the contractor is not bound to take into account community impacts outside of the strict requirements and as the contractor will be trying to deliver the project as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is likely that the additional measure proposed with respect to construction noise mitigation for (example) will not be adopted. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS is riddled with caveats and lacks clear obligations and requirements fn project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail.

D. There has been no 'meaningful' consultation with the community. Some areas affected by M3/M5 have not even been letterboxed by SMC. These include St Peters and sections of Erskineville. The SMC received hundreds of submissions on its concept design and failed to respond to any of these before lodging this EIS.

E. The EIS at 12-57 describes potentially serious problems where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs. Why is SMC proposing tunnelling within metres of these critical services when no accurate surveying has been done? And when there is only limited information available about the strength of these water tunnels ? The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: MANDY BOBBS	
Address: 303/4 Denison St Post Code 2050	Suburb Camperdown
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website (Yes) / No	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	
Signed Amanda Bobbs	Date 26/9/17

- **Traffic and transport – new right hand turning lane on the City West Link to James St**

  I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent is planning to create a right hand turning lane on the City West Link to allow construction vehicles to turn right into James Street.

  This is a dangerous proposal given that it involves turning into a steep blind corner which carries a high degree of risk of collision with oncoming vehicles and with pedestrians including the many school children who cross James St at this point.

  It is reckless beyond belief to plan for large number of truck and dogs to make a right - hand turn into James St from the City West Link. Even vehicles crossing the City West Link from the Lilyfield Rd side of the City West Link have a higher risk of collision or error due to the steep blind turn. This would be even higher when making a right hand turn into James St from the City West Link.

  This intersection is reported as being the third most dangerous for accidents in the Inner West.

  I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because a right hand turning lane on the City West Link to allow construction vehicles to turn right into James Street creates an unacceptable risk of death and bodily injury due to collision.

  The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Safer alternatives have been identified which will allow spoil haulage directly onto the City West Link and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Amanda Davies	
Address: 303/4 Denison St Post Code 2050	Suburb Camperdown
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website (Yes) / No	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	
Signed: Amanda Davies	Date 26/9/17

Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction - Traffic

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact it will have on traffic, parking and local residences. The grounds on which I am objecting were also the grounds for rejecting a previous development on this site, which was only approved by the Land and Environment Court with strict conditions.

On 5 December 2006 the Building & Development Council of Leichhardt Council refused Development Application D/2006/311 in relation to 7 Darley Road, which was an application for alterations and additions to existing building and change of use of existing building for use as a liquor store, cafe/deli and commercial office space, new landscaping and signage. Hundreds of local residents had lodged objections to the DA. One of the grounds on which the application was refused was that the RTA did not support the access arrangements and would not allow right hand turns into the site, which is precisely what the proponent is now proposing. The following extract from the decision sets out why the RTA objected to the DA:

> "The application has proposed a number of traffic management measures along Darley Road, included painted median islands.
>
> The RTA does not support the access arrangements as proposed and has advised that it is likely to create conflicts at the shared entry/exit near Hubert Street. It has been recommended that there be separate entry and exit driveways, with the entry nearest to Charles Street, and the exit at the driveway crossing near Hubert Street.
>
> The RTA has advised that these driveways must be physically restricted with left-in/left-out movements through the provision of 900mm wide concrete median islands, covering the width of each driveway and extend to a distance of 10 metres either side of each driveway crossing. The parking area along the eastern section of the site must also be restricted to left-in/left-out movements.
>
> On the advice the of the RTA, no right-turn into the site is then possible, potentially encouraging west-bound traffic on Darley Road to conduct 'U-turns' at the Charles Street intersection to access the carpark, creating a conflict at that point.
>
> Council's engineers have advised that the proposed traffic management works on the Darley Street frontage have a number of deficiencies including:

- Traffic lanes on the southern side of Darley Street would be relocated onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
- The proposed kerbside traffic lane on the southern side of Darley Street would conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures. Significant drainage works would be required to address this issue without exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.

Advice from the RTA has also noted the unsuitability of the existing kerbside parking and bicycle lanes for a through lane due to its cross-fall. The RTA have further advised that the bicycle lane along Darley Road must be retained, and that no objections are raise to the proposed pedestrian refuge, subject to compliance with the relevant Australian standards. "The RTA also raised objections in relation to traffic that the bottle shop development would generate:

"It is expected that the peak traffic generation periods for the development would be Friday evenings and Saturdays, with Thursday evening also busy. Conflict with the morning peak hour is therefore expected to be limited. It is noted that the traffic surveys were conducted prior to the closure of Moore Street West, Leichhardt.

Anecdotal evidence has suggested that traffic flow has increased on east-west thoroughfares such as Darley Road and Marion Street since the closure.

Traffic generation figures supplied in the traffic report initially submitted to Council were derived strictly from the amount of carparking provided on the site.

The revised traffic generation figures provided as a result of the additional parking provided on the site. It has factored that 35% of traffic to the site are passing trips. It has not accounted for spill-over traffic that cannot be accommodated on the site.

These figures would appear to conflict with statement within the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) that was submitted to the LAB for approval. This document indicates that the 'catchment' for the proposed liquor outlet is considerably larger and it states "In contrast Dan Murphy's OLR's are larger format destination stores designed to appeal to a regional market ..."

It has also been noted that the proposed liquor store alone would expect up to sixty (60) deliveries a week.

The study derives that the likely additional traffic on the local network would be:

- Thursday evening – some 150 vehicles/hour (in + out)
- Friday evening - some 156 vehicles/hour (in + out)
- midday - some 228 vehicles/hour (in + out)

Of particular concern in this regard is that the 'No stopping' restriction required by the RTA for the northern side of Darley Road during the Thursday and Friday evening peaks, which may funnel overflow parking into the surrounding residential streets. Furthermore, the substantial increase in traffic flow at the Saturday peak may result in significant queuing at the City-West intersection as all vehicles are forced to left-turn exiting the site.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered unsatisfactory when having regard to traffic and parking impacts."

It is clear that the same traffic impacts raised by the RTA will be a consequence of the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these. The proponent's plan to bring 100 trucks a day into the site will result in significant queuing at the City-West intersection yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these.

The removal of 20 parking spaces Darley Rd and the absence of a worker parking plan will funnel overflow parking into the surrounding residential streets which are already at parking capacity yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these.

The following points of concern were also raised in the Council's rejection of the bottle shop DA:

> "Traffic and parking impact on Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network/ vehicular – pedestrian conflict, especially with school children/ increase noise from traffic movements and truck loading and unloading.
>
> The increase in traffic movements to the site are likely to have an undue acoustic impact on the dwellings located opposite site, particularly as a result of late-night movements.

The proponent has failed to adequately address the fact that the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt will have the same impacts of:

- Traffic and parking impact on Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network
- vehicular – pedestrian conflict, especially with school children/
- increase noise from traffic movements and truck loading and unloading.

The proponent has failed to address the fact that the increase in traffic movements to the site are likely to have an undue acoustic impact on the dwellings located opposite site, particularly as a result of late-night movements. The proponent plans to have workers on site 24 / 7. Late night and out of hours comings and goings by vehicle are to be expected yet the proponent has failed to address the impact of these vehicle movements on local residents.

The site should not be permitted to operate outside of standard constructions hours because of the noise impacts from construction vehicles, delivery vehicles and worker transportation vehicles. The following Traffic Management deficiencies were also raised in the Council's rejection of the bottle shop DA:

> "The proposed Traffic Management works on the Darley Road frontage have a number of deficiencies including:
>
> (a) Traffic lanes on the southern side of Darley Road would be relocated onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
>
> (b) The proposed kerbside traffic lane on the southern side of Darley Road would conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures. Significant drainage works would be required to address this issue without exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.

(c) The access arrangement for the parking area on the western side of the site will create traffic conflict at the shared entry/exit driveway near Hubert Street.

(d) The application would result in the loss of on-street parking spaces on the southern side of Darley Road.

(e) The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the traffic management proposal complies with the RTA requirements for works on a State Road.

(f) The site plans do not adequately address internal vehicle manoeuvring for large trucks accessing the 2 loading docks.

(g) The application has failed to demonstrate how the existing bicycle lane would be maintained.

The application has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an undue increase in traffic

generation along Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network.

(a) The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated assumptions made in their report regarding parking demand and traffic generation.

(b) The traffic generation assumption for passing or redistributed trips is not validated.

(c) The design does not adequately address the impacts from vehicle queuing in Darley Road."

The same deficiencies are present in the proponent's EIS and the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt should be rejected on the same grounds:

- construction trucks travelling on the southern side of Darley Road will force traffic onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
- the construction works will conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures which will exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.
- The access arrangement for the site will create traffic conflict at the shared entry/exit driveway near Hubert Street.
- The application would result in the loss of on-street parking spaces on the southern side of Darley Road.
- There is no traffic management proposal.
- The proponent has failed to demonstrate how the existing bicycle lane would be maintained.
- The proponent has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an undue increase in traffic generation along Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network.
- The proponent has failed to adequately address the impacts from vehicle queuing in Darley Road."

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

Name: Heidi Bishof

Signature: H Bishof

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

Address: 46 Wetherill St

Suburb: Leichhardt 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 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 no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be date. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.

- The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)

☐ The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the site which includes a mature tree. I object to the removal of the tree which creates a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the tree is removed it must be replaced with a mature tree as soon as the remediation of the site commences.

☐ 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.

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

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

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

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: Laura + Pierre Mahney 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: 302 Elswick Street Suburb: LEICHHARDT Postcode 2040

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

- Environmental issues – contamination – Leichhardt: 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.

- Location of permanent Motorway operations complex on Darley Road – Leichhardt: We strongly object to the proposed location of this permanent operational facility on Darley Road. The presence of this site contradicts repeated assurances to the community that the site would be returned after construction was completed. The ongoing presence of this site will limit future uses of the darley Road site which could serve community purposes, particularly given its location directly next to public transport. Its presence removes the ability to provide more accessible, safer and direct pedestrian access to the North Leichhardt Light Rail Station. The plant location, in a neighbourhood setting is not appropriate. It will reduce property values and have an unacceptable impacts on the visual amenity of the area. The streets adjacent to Darley Road are comprised of low-rise residential homes and small businesses and infrastructure such as this should not be permitted in such a location.

- Alternative housing for residents – Leichhardt: The EIS needs to provide specific detail as to what will be provided by way of alternative accommodation to the 36 residents identified as suffering extreme noise interference. There is no plan to temporarily relocate such residents, not to offer them financial compensation to enable them to move out during the worst period. There is an estimated 10 weeks of extreme noise during demolition of the commercial building and preparatory road works. Once this work is finished the residents will also be forced to endure a truck every 304 minutes for a period of five years. It is clearly not possible for such residents to continue to live in these houses and the EIS needs to detail what will be provided in terms of alternative living arrangements for part, or all of the construction work period.

- Access tunnel from Darley Road – Leichhardt: 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.

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

Name Laura Mahney Email lgm3121@gmail.com Mobile 0466324432

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:* Freija Brandie *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:* 85/20 Eve Street *Suburb:* Erskineville *Postcode* 2043

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

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

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Freya Brandie Signature:
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	*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.*
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: 85/20 Eve Street Suburb: Erskineville Postcode 2043

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 extensivedamages 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 _____

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: Freija Brandie 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: 85/20 Eve Street Suburb: Erskineville Postcode 2043

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

- SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware and Enmore Roads and through the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.
- The EIS at 12-57 describes potentially serious problems where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs. Why is SMC proposing tunnelling within metres of these critical services when no accurate surveying has been done? And when there is only limited information available about the strength of these water tunnels ? The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects ?
- There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.
- I object to the 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.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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: Freyja Brandle 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: 85/20 Eve Street Suburb: Erskineville Postcode 2043

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).

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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: Kristie Mellor Address: 10 Harrington Street
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Enmore Postcode 2042
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

- The decision to build a three-stage tollway instead of expanding public transport has never been subjected to democratic decision-making and in fact has been opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages.
- The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. We now have proposals for Stages 1,2 and 3 and none achieve this goal. The community is asked to support this proposal on the basis of other major unfunded projects, which are little more than ideas on a map. This is NOT the way to plan a liveable city.
- There will be 100 workers a day on the site, with provision for only 10-20 car spaces and there is a concession that local streets will be used, who will be 'encouraged' to use public transport. Our experience with the major construction sites in Haberfield, and St Peters that public transport is not used by the workers and that despite the fact they are not supposed to do so, they park in our local streets and cause strife with our residents.
- The EIS at 7-21 states that Community update Newsletters were distributed to residents 'near the project footprint' in many suburbs. This statement is simply not correct. No such newsletters were received by residents in central and northern Newtown. SMC was made aware of this fact, but has not responded to verbal and written requests for audited confirmation of the addresses 'letterboxed'. This statement of community engagement should be rejected by the Department.
- Darley Road is confirmed as a 'civil and tunnel site (dive site) with a 'Motorway Operations' site at one end for machinery during the build and will then house permanent water treatment facilities, despite evidence tendered to the Concept Design explaining that this intersection has an high accident rate and is completely unsuitable for such a purpose.
- I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project, There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Peters and Haberfield or Rozelle, all traffic going to the CBD, East or into the Inner West will use local roads.
- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
- Why is there no detailed information about the so called 'King Street Gateway' included in the EIS ?
- I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.
- An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow 'swoosh' that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be 'encouraged' to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that 'definitive' rather than 'indicative' alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair 'definitive' document open for genuine public comment.

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: Anna D. Timmer 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: 306 Elswick St Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040

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

- The project will worsen traffic near the Darley Road civil and tunnel site during and after construction – Leichhardt: 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, iot will drastically increase both local traffic and outer area traffic at peak commute times. We therefore object to the location of this site based on the unacceptable traffic impacts it will have on road users and on pedestrians.

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

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

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

Signature: G. Elder

*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: 179 Sylvania Rd.

Suburb: Miranda Postcode 2228

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

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 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 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.

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:	ANA NURTE
Address:	48 HUBERT ST Suburb LEICHHARDT Post Code 2040
Signature:	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / No	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

Noise impacts

- **I object** to the EIS because the proponent incorrectly asserts construction traffic is unlikely to result in a noticeable increase in LAeq noise levels at receivers along the proposed construction traffic routes (Darley Road, Leichhardt and City West Link). This does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site. The impact of these will be substantial.

  Commercial trucks are very loud; a standard diesel engine produces approximately 100 decibels (dB) of noise.

  Engine braking noise can be disturbing both because it is loud and also as it has a distinctive characteristic modulation. Engine braking noise is caused by pulses of gases being emitted from the truck exhaust system, giving a 'machine gun' sound.

  I object to the Darley Rd site because of the level of noise that the trucks will cause.

Truck routes

- **I object** to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be detailed in the CTAMP, Preferred Infrastructure Report or Ancillary Facilities Management Plan.
  Peter Jones of SMC has on many occasions made representations to the community that his plan is to stage trucks from the port and eventually when possible to have them arrive and depart from the site underground when a tunnel is established between Leichhardt and the M4 East. He has also said that loading of spoil would take place underground at this time. He has recently told us of his plan to load trucks from a ramp off the city west link by means of a hopper conveyor which would pass over the Light rail station delivering spoil into silos below which trucks would pull up to receive their load. The laden trucks would then travel west bound along the city west link. None of this plan is detailed in the EIS.
  I object to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. **I object** to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into the CTAMP, PIR or AFMP on matters which will have a devastating impact to me and to residents near 7 Darley Rd.

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: Ian Close

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: 42 Rozelle Foucart 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 Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The City West Link Eastbound AM and PM peak hour and other locations."Table 7-19 shows that several locations are forecast to exceed theoretical roadway capacity with the increased background traffic and the construction traffic in the 2021 AM and PM peak hours. However, traffic on the majority of these roads would exceed their theoretical capacity even without the construction traffic, simply due to the growth in background traffic". So in the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, massive amounts of construction traffic are going to be added for the whole construction period of 5 years. Even on completion it is stated in the EIS that traffic will be worse in this area than 'without the project'. This categorically shows that the planning of Westconnex is totally inadequate and needs major changes. It also shows that when completed Westconnex will not work. It is abundantly obvious that Rail/Metro is the only option to radically overhaul Sydney's failed transport systems

- I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.

- 2 G Appendix P Table 5-27 of the EIS states that 43% of the Leichhardt- Glebe Precinct travel to work by Car, 21% by Bus and 5%by Rail. These are figures for 2011. These figures are being used to promote the project and suggest they are accurate today. In the case of Rail these figures are extremely questionable. The Light Rail is now hugely popular, it's use having grown enormously. It is travelling at full capacity at Peak hours. More services are being put in place. Apartment blocks are being built as close to the Light Rail corridor as possible. Residents see the Light Rail as an efficient, reliable and timely method of commuting to work. It is blatantly obvious that the Govt should be investing heavily in building and extending Light Rail, Metro and Rail. If this were pursued in a professional manner the necessity for trying to hoodwink the community into believing that Westconnex were needed would be totally unnecessary.

- The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.

005444-M00001

...on Director ...structure Projects, Planning Services, ...partment of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Ian Close Address: 42 Foucart St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Rozelle Postcode 2039
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

- 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)

- 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.

- Out of hours work - Pyrmont Bridge Road site - Up to 14 'receivers' at this site are predicted to have impacts from high noise impacts during out of hours work for construction and pavement works for approximately 2 weeks caused by the use of a rock-breaker. Again, no plans to relocate or compensate residents affected is provided in the EIS (EIS, XV) The only mitigation contained in the EIS is that the use of the road profiler is to be limited during out of hours works 'where feasible.' (Table 5-120) In other words, there is no mitigation whatsoever for residents affected by daytime noise and a possibility that they will be similarly affected out of hours where the contractor considers that it isn't feasible to limit the use of the road profiler. This represents an inadequate response to managing these severe noise impacts for residents.

- Targets for renewable energy and offsets are unclear

- Noise from trucks entering and exiting the site - Pyrmont Bridge Road site - The EIS states that there will be noise 'exceedances' for trucks entering and exiting the site (Table 5-120) No detail is provided as to the level of any such 'exceedance'. Nor does it propose any mitigation other than investigations into 'locations' where hoarding above 2 metres can be utilized to control trucks in the queuing area. This does not result in any firm plans to manage the noise. Nor is enough detail provided so that those affected can comment on the effectiveness of this proposed mitigation measure

- Increased traffic on Bridge Road, Wattle Street and the Western Distributor will reduce the amenity and value of the investment in the renewal of the Fish Markets and renewal of the Bays Market District

- Despite the promise of the WestConnex business case, Parramatta Road remains a barrier to urban revitalisation. There is no discussion of this commitment in the EIS.

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Adena Massey	
Address: 10 Pretoria St	Suburb Haberfield
Post Code 2040	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website (Yes) / No	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	
Signed: A Massey	Date 26/09/2017

- **Traffic and transport – hours of operation for spoil removal**

  I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS which require that the Proponent must assess construction transport and traffic (vehicle, pedestrian and cyclists) impacts in relation to access constraints and impacts on public transport, pedestrians and cyclists.

  The proponent's failure stems from its contradictory and inconsistent assessment of the impacts of spoil removal from the site. In 8.3.1 of the EIS the proponent states that 'Where practical, spoil would be removed during the day, outside of peak periods.'

  This is completely at odds with the proponents own figures for heavy vehicle movements in peak hour. In Table 8-42 Indicative daily and peak period construction traffic volumes it is indicated that there will be 14 heavy vehicle movements in the AM and PM peak. This is a spoil truck movement every 4 minutes. If the EIS is approved as is then the proponent's contractor will be permitted to remove spoil during peak periods and would have no constraints on the number of truck movements per hour.

  No doubt in order to complete the project on time the contractor will have the maximum number of truck movements possible regardless of the impact on residents. I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because spoil trucks on Darley Rd will create traffic congestion during peak times (which are in actual fact longer than the peak hours on which the proponent bases its analysis).

  I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because spoil trucks on Darley Rd will create traffic queues and will increase traffic through local streets. The proponent is the guardian of the road network and knows that this will be the result.

  The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Alternatives have been identified which will allow spoil haulage directly onto the City West Link and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:	ADELE MASSEY
Address: 10 PARTRIDGE ST Post Code 2040.	Suburb LILYFIELD.
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website (Yes) / No Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	
Signed: A Massey	Date 26/09/2017

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

- **Air quality – exhaust emissions**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable. In particular I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site because of the impact it will have on health.

In 9.3 'Construction assessment methodology' of the EIS the proponent states that one of the main air pollution and amenity considerations at demolition/construction sites is increased concentrations of airborne particles and NO2 due to exhaust emissions from on-site diesel-powered vehicles and construction equipment. In 9.3 the proponent also states that **'Exhaust emissions from on-site plant and site traffic are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality, and in the majority of cases they would not need to be quantitatively assessed.'**

This assessment is incorrect in the case of the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site in Leichhardt and the Department of Planning must require the proponent to submit an assessment.

The proponent sets out elsewhere in the EIS its plan to run spoil trucks in and out of the site via Darley Rd/James St.

A full laden truck and dog driving up the steep blind section of Darley Rd/James St will have to use high gears and high revs to get up the hill. This will take longer than for other vehicles because of the size of a truck and dog and the extensive traffic queuing that takes place at the intersection. The proponent anticipates there being a truck every 4 minutes in peak hour which coincides with the peak of foot traffic near the intersection. This means a truck every traffic light cycle. This will create unacceptable concentrations of diesel exhaust in an area used by a lot of pedestrians to get to and from the North Leichhardt light rail stop.

The Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site in Leichhardt should not be allowed to proceed because of the health impacts from diesel exhaust.

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: ADAM MASSEY	
Address: 10 PRETORIA ST Post Code 2040	Suburb KILLARA
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website (Yes) / No Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	
Signed: [signature]	Date 26/09/2017

- **Traffic and transport - use of local roads by heavy vehicles**

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS which require that the Proponent must assess construction transport and traffic (vehicle, pedestrian and cyclists) impacts in relation to access constraints and impacts on public transport, pedestrians and cyclists.

In Note 1 to Table 8-43 'Indicative access routes to and from construction ancillary facilities' the proponent states that 'Some use of local roads by heavy vehicles delivering materials and/or equipment may also be required, however this would be minimised as far as practicable.'

The experience of residents in local streets near other tunnel construction sites such as the streets near the M4 East site at Northcote St Haberfield is that heavy and light vehicles use these local streets and cause a high level of adverse impact. The complaints relate to construction vehicles parking out local residents, idling engines, using local roads after hours and carrying rattling loads that increase the noise impact to residents.

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because if it is allowed to proceed then it is inevitable that residents of Charles St, Hubert St and Francis St, which are quiet residential streets, will experience these same very adverse impacts. Once approval is given residents will not be able to enforce a minimal level of use of local roads by light or heavy vehicles associated with the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road. It is inevitable that minimal use will become standard use. The contractor who is appointed to the project will be allowed to use local roads and will not be able to stop sub-contractors using local roads.

The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Alternatives have been identified which would avoid or minimise the use of local streets and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: ADELE MASSON	
Address: 10 PRETORIA ST	Suburb HILLFIELD
Post Code 2040	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / No	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	
Signed:	Date 26/09/2017

- **Traffic and transport – new right hand turning lane on the City West Link to James St**

  I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent is planning to create a right hand turning lane on the City West Link to allow construction vehicles to turn right into James Street.

  This is a dangerous proposal given that it involves turning into a steep blind corner which carries a high degree of risk of collision with oncoming vehicles and with pedestrians including the many school children who cross James St at this point.

  It is reckless beyond belief to plan for large number of truck and dogs to make a right - hand turn into James St from the City West Link. Even vehicles crossing the City West Link from the Lilyfield Rd side of the City West Link have a higher risk of collision or error due to the steep blind turn. This would be even higher when making a right hand turn into James St from the City West Link.

  This intersection is reported as being the third most dangerous for accidents in the Inner West.

  I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because a right hand turning lane on the City West Link to allow construction vehicles to turn right into James Street creates an unacceptable risk of death and bodily injury due to collision.

  The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Safer alternatives have been identified which will allow spoil haulage directly onto the City West Link and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: DENNIS DARCY Address: 87 ROUNTREE ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: BALMAIN Postcode 2041
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. **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.
2. **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. The EIS needs to detail how this risk of crashes will be managed to an acceptable level, which it does not.
3. **Worker parking** – Leichhardt. There is provision in the EIS for only a dozen worker car parks and no provision for the 100 or so workers who will be permanently based at the Darley Road site for up to five years. A major construction site project should not be permitted in a neighbourhood area without allocated parking for **all** workers. No other business would be permitted to be established without this requirement being satisfied – why is it acceptable for this project? In addition, the EIS proposes the removal of 20 car spaces used by residents on Darley Road and will remove the 'kiss and ride' facility at the light rail stop. This will result in residents being unable to park in their own street and will increase noise impacts from workers doing shift changeovers 24 hours a day. The EIS needs to mandate the use of public transport or provide for workers to be bussed in if adequate allocated parking is not provided.
4. **Number of vehicle movements** – Leichhardt. The EIS states that there will be 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day during construction (5 years). There is no guarantee that these figures are accurate as they are indicative only. The effect of these movements will be drastically increased commuter times for anyone accessing the City West Link during peak periods. The Darley Road site is equally busy on Saturday and this is not accounted for or acknowledged in the EIS. The EIS should not permit this number of vehicle movements and should be rejected on this basis as there is no plan as to how this will be managed. Referring to a future traffic management plan is inadequate – there is no guarantee that any such plan will be able to manage this traffic impact to an acceptable level.
5. **Access routes** – Leichhardt. The EIS states that all construction vehicles will enter and leave via Darley Road. Although near the City West Link, Darley Rd abuts a large number of small, local streets and homes and streets near Darley Road will be impacted by a heavy vehicle movement every 3-4 minutes. This is an unacceptable impact. No heavy or light vehicle movements should be permitted on Darley Road whatsoever and an alternative route which does not involve Darley Road is the only route that should be approved.

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

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: DENNIS DARLEY Address: 87 ROWNTREE ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: BALMAIN Postcode 2041
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. **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.
2. **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.
3. **Alternative access route for trucks – Leichhardt:** The EIS states that there are 'investigations' occurring into alternative access to the Darley Road site. The EIS does not provide any detail on which residents can comment about alternative access which would keep trucks off Darley Road. The plans for alternative access should be expedited. It should be a condition of approval that the alternative access is confirmed and that no spoil trucks are permitted to access Darley Road due to the unacceptable noise, safety and traffic issues that the current proposal creates.
4. **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.
5. **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 _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Dennis Darcy Address: 87 Rainford St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: BALMAIN Postcode 2041
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. **Construction hours – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that works affecting parts of the surface road network 'subject to high traffic volumes' will occur out of hours. As Darley Road falls into this category it is likely residents will be subjected to regular out of hours works. This is an unacceptable impact given the EIS provides for 10 weeks of surface works. Any approval conditions need to place a reasonable and enforceable limit on the number of nights of out of hours work.
2. **EIS is 'indicative only'** The EIS states that the EIS is indicative only and can be subject to change by the contractor. In addition, the community will have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs, nor on the preferred Infrastructure Report. The EIS should not be approved as it does not give the community a meaningful opportunity to comment on the impacts to which it will be subject to as a result of this project.
3. **Lack of information** The EIS sets out the 'consultation' which has occurred with the community over the past 12 months. However, these consultation sessions have not provided any meaningful information. And in the EIS no detail is provided as to how impacts will be managed. For example, the traffic will be subject to a traffic management plan. What is traffic cannot be managed to an acceptable level at Darley Road? The EIS does not provide any assurance that impacts such as congestion caused by the addition of 170 vehicle movements a day at the Darley Road site, will be managed to an acceptable level.
4. **Blackmore oval.** The EIS states that Blackmore Oval was not taken for this project as a result of feedback from the community. I understand that the site was unsuitable for tunneling as it suffered from flooding and was ruled out on this basis. The EIS should not contain misrepresentations such as this.
5. **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.
6. **Leichhardt North Light Rail** – The presence of hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery at the Darley Road site will make it difficult and hazardous for pedestrians to access the light rail. There is no detail in the EIS as to how this impact will be managed and the EIS should not be approved without properly identifying management strategies for this risk.

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

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: DENNIS DANEY Address: 87 ROWNTREE ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: BALMAIN Postcode 2041
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. **Acquisition and demolition 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. It is also wasteful that several million dollars was spent on renovations, for the entire structure to de demolished less than 18 months later.
2. **Night works – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that to minimize disruptions to traffic on the existing road network (including in peak hours) there will be night works where appropriate. Given the congested nature of Darley Road, it is likely there will be frequent night work (EIS, 6.4). This will create an unacceptable impact in residents. It is unacceptable that a highly unsuitable site has been selected. And, instead of a proper plan to manage traffic, the EIS contemplate work simply occurring at night. This is objected to in the strongest terms.
3. **Additional facilities.** The EIS states that the contractor may decide upon additional 'construction ancillary facilities' to the 12 identified in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be more unidentified sites taken, as residents will have no opportunity to comment on their impacts. The approval condition should limit any construction facilities to those already notified and detailed in the EIS.
4. **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.
5. **Noise mitigation – Leichhardt.** The noise mitigation proposed in the EIS is unacceptable. No detail of noise walls is provided, giving residents no opportunity to comment on whether final impacts are acceptable. This is despite the fact 36 homes are identified in the EIS as severely affected by construction noise. The acoustic shed proposed is of the lowest grade and does not cover the entire site, resulting in noise impacts from the movement of trucks in and out of the tunnel access point. The highest grade acoustic shed should be provided, with the shed covering the entire site. The additional noise mitigation such as noise walls, need to be set out in detail so that residents can properly comment on the impacts.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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: DARWARD DARLEY Address: 87 BOWLTRAR ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: BALMAIN Postcode 2041
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. **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.
2. **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.
3. **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.
4. **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.
5. **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 9followign a proper investigation and consideration of all options) then the approval needs to specify that all streets are replaced with mature, native trees at the conclusion of the construction at the site.

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

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Jenny Orchard Address: 329 Catherine St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Lilyfield Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

- 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.

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

- The 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.

- 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 thereformpossible to form a properly informed understanding of the environmental impacts – the very purpose of the EIS.

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

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:	[redacted]		
Address:	[redacted]	Suburb [redacted]	Post Code [redacted]
Signature:	[redacted]		
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / No			
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.			

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

Cumulative impacts of aircraft noise and construction noise

- **I object** to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and the aircraft noise which the residents near the site already endure.

  The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.

  Airservices Australia reports that in April to June 2017 the number of average daily noise events over 70 dBA. In Leichhardt this is an average of 16- 17 per hour over the peak morning period and 16 per hour in the early evening peak period.



I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel engine, exhaust and potentially air brake noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours.

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:	[redacted]
Address: [redacted] Suburb [redacted] Post Code	
Signature: [redacted]	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / (No)	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

Cumulative impacts of aircraft emissions and spoil truck emissions

- **I object** to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of emissions from spoil truck vehicles from it proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and emissions from aircraft to which residents near the site are already exposed.

  The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.

  Airplane exhaust, like car exhaust, contains a variety of air pollutants, including sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Many of these particles of pollution are tiny, about a hundred millionths of an inch wide, or smaller than the width of a human hair. So-called particulate matter that's especially small is the main culprit in human health effects, especially since the particulates can become wedged deep in the lung and possibly enter the bloodstream, scientists say.

  Exposure to loud noise from living under a flight path over a long period of time may increase the risk of developing high blood pressure or having a stroke, a 2013 study by researches at the University of Athens suggests.

  Researchers examined data from 420 people living near busy Athens International Airport in Greece and found living with high noise levels from aircraft, especially at night, was associated with high blood pressure.

  Every additional 10 decibels of night-time aircraft noise appeared to result in a 69 per cent increased risk of high blood pressure, also known as hypertension.

  The researchers at the University of Athens found that around half the participants (just under 45 per pent) were exposed to more than 55 decibels of daytime aircraft noise, while around one in four (just over 27 per cent) were exposed to more than 45 decibels of night-time aircraft noise.

  Only around one in 10 (11 per cent) were exposed to significant road traffic noise of more than 55 decibels.

  Between 2004-6 and 2013, 71 people were newly diagnosed with high blood pressure and 44 were diagnosed with heart flutter (cardiac arrhythmia), while a further 18 had a heart attack, the researchers found.

  I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because in addition to the existing aircraft emissions and noise experienced by people living near the site, this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel exhaust emissions and noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours. This will give rise to increased health risks from noise and air pollution which research suggest will cause increased blood pressure and risk of stroke.

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:	[redacted]
Address:	[redacted] Suburb [redacted] Post Code [redacted]
Signature:	[redacted]
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / (No)	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

Non-compliance with SEARS

- **I object** to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and **all components and activities** (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.

  Peter Jones from Sydney Motorway Corporation has advised that he is in the process of finalising an agreement with Sydney Ports which will enable him to stage trucks from a location on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. The EIS should not have been released before this plan was finalised. Peter Jones has advised that he is only required to describe the 'worst case scenario' in the EIS, which is trucks arriving ad hoc via the eastbound lanes of City West Link. The EIS should describe what the proponent actually plans to do as well as the worst case scenario so that the impacts of all options being considered can be assessed and commented on.

  It is not clear from the EIS how the alternative plan for the staged arrival of spoil trucks from Sydney Ports will be documented and how stakeholders will have an opportunity to assess its impacts. The EIS does not specifically state that this staged arrival plan will be documented in the CTAMP, the Ancillary Facilities Management Plan or the Preferred Infrastructure Report.

  I object to the EIS on the grounds that it does not comply with the SEARS.

Truck routes

- **I object** to the EIS because it suggests that no local roads would be used by heavy vehicles during works yet at the same time acknowledges that spoil trucks may use local roads in exceptional circumstances which include when there is queuing to get into the site. Darley Rd is highly congested with traffic queues forming during much of the day which will lead to queues to enter the site. Queuing will not therefore be an exceptional circumstance and the result will be that spoil trucks are able to use local roads without being in breach, which will be often. This is unacceptable to residents of Francis, Hubert, William and Charles St and **I object** to the EIS on this basis. As queuing cannot be avoided on Darley Rd this clearly shows why this location is inappropriate. The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?

Noise impacts

- **I object** to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of fully laden spoil haulage trucks exiting the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt driving up the very steep blind turn at the intersection with the City West Link. The RMS should install noise measuring equipment and monitoring cameras at this location to measure noise from heavy vehicles and identify vehicles whose noise that exceeds the applicable Australian standard.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Signature: [redacted]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / (No)

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

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

Noise impacts

- Many residents in Charles St and Hubert St were highly affected by noise from works conducted during the renovation of 7 Darley Rd in 2016. In Hubert St, residents at least as far as No 31 and No 32 Hubert St were affected. The affected properties are not correctly reflected in the EIS.

  I object to the EIS because it underestimates the number of residents that will be highly affected by noise. It does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site.

Pedestrian and cyclist movements

- **I object** to the EIS because it fails to describe the temporary changes to Darley Road, Leichhardt to enable access to and from the ancillary facility that would likely be required in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be decided by the contractor.

  The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that:

  'Temporary changes to Darley Road to enable access to and from the ancillary facility would likely be required. These may include changes to line marking to provide a temporary turning lane for construction traffic and temporary diversions to the pedestrian path on the northern side of Darley Road. These would be confirmed during detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor and in consideration of the safety and function of the road network, maintaining access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop and providing for continued pedestrian and cyclist movement. '

  It is not clear how continued access, pedestrian and cyclist movement will be preserved and I am concerned that the impacts have not been correctly identified and assessed by the proponent.

  I object to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. **I object** to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor.

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:	[redacted]
Address:	[redacted] Suburb [redacted] Post Code [redacted]
Signature:	[redacted]
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / (No)	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

Hours of operation

- **I object** to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

  The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

  '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. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would be kept informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site.

  The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

Noise impacts

- The resident's of Darley Rd, Francis, Hubert and Charles St have little acoustic protection against the noise of truck engines, exhaust and brakes and none is contemplated in the EIS.

  I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because the truck noise impacts for residents will be too great for the extended period of construction involved and the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt should be rejected on this basis.

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: Tess Pollock

Signature: Tess Pollock

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: 17 Dickson Street

Suburb: Newtown *Postcode* 2042

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

- The EIS social an economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestCONnex has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.

- The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.

- The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.

- I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.

- The EIS acknowledges that impacts of construction should M4M5 get approval will worsen traffic congestions on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it would be outrageous for motorists to be asked to pay up to up to $20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.

- Streets in Haberfield would be subject to heavy vehicle traffic for a further four years, making at least 7 years of heavy impacts on a single suburb. The answer is not a "community strategy'. Residents who believed that their pain would be over after the M4 east are now being asked to sustain a further four years of impacts. No compensation or serious mitigation is suggested.

- The EIS acknowledges that four years of M4/M5 construction would have a negative economic and social impact across the Inner West through interrupted traffic routes, slower traffic times, disruption with public transport, interruption with businesses and loss of connections across communities. This finding highlights the need for a proper cost benefit analysis for the project. Such social costs should not simply be dismissed with the promise of a construction plan into which the community has not input or powers to enforce.

- I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

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

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Gemma McKenzie-Booth
	Address: 52 Ashmore St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Erskineville Postcode 2043
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

1. The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors.
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, which has multiple commercial interests in WestConnex.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters, Haberfield and Rozelle Interchanges will disrupt local transport networks including bus and active transport (walking and cycling).
8. I oppose the destruction of any more of Sydney's heritage for WestCONnex. I am appalled that Sydney Motorway Corporation is seeking approval to tunnel under hundreds of highly valued heritage buildings in Newtown without any serious assessment of risk at all. This heritage belongs to all of Sydney.
9. 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 is 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.
10. I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.
11. 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.
12. Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. An extra exhaust stack on the NW corner of the St Peters interchange will increase pollution in an area where the prevailing winds will spread emissions over residences, schools and sports fields. St Peters Primary School will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the SW and NW corners of the interchange.
13. The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link – in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area – in Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters and Newtown -is an unknown hazard to buildings. Residents have found it hard enough to get compensation for damage done to buildings by Stage One and Two. Two different tunnelling operations taking place at such proximity will further increase difficulty because private contractors will blame the other project.

In this submission I have only been able to include some of my objections to this EIS. We have already witnessed the destruction of tracts of Haberfield and St Peters. It is time to consider this entire project before more damage is done.

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

Signature: [signature]

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

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

Address: 8 COOK ST

Suburb: ROZELLE 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

- 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.

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: Lee Sadarkis

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: PO Box 241

Suburb: Hazelbrook *Postcode* 2779

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

- The EIS social an economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestCONnex has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.

- The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.

- The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.

- I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.

- The EIS acknowledges that impacts of construction should M4M5 get approval will worsen traffic congestions on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it would be outrageous for motorists to be asked to pay up to up to $20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.

- Streets in Haberfield would be subject to heavy vehicle traffic for a further four years, making at least 7 years of heavy impacts on a single suburb. The answer is not a "community strategy'. Residents who believed that their pain would be over after the M4 east are now being asked to sustain a further four years of impacts. No compensation or serious mitigation is suggested.

- The EIS acknowledges that four years of M4/M5 construction would have a negative economic and social impact across the Inner West through interrupted traffic routes, slower traffic times, disruption with public transport, interruption with businesses and loss of connections across communities. This finding highlights the need for a proper cost benefit analysis for the project. Such social costs should not simply be dismissed with the promise of a construction plan into which the community has not input or powers to enforce.

- I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

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

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:* KATHLEEN MULLINS *Signature:* K Mullins *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:* 84 ANGEL ST., *Suburb:* NEWTOWN *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.

i. The St Peters and Rozelle interchanges at are of particular concern. St Peters will have large volumes of vehicles accelerating and decelerating as they enter and exit tunnels and access roads, next to proposed playing fields. This is complicated by emissions stacks located in the Interchange – whereby pollution from the interchange is supercharged by the emissions from the stacks

ii. the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) for the EIS (Page 8-2 – Table 8-1) require the Applicant to consider the operational transport impact of toll avoidance however information provided on toll avoidance in Chapter 9.8 (Page 222) of Appendix H is limited to four short paragraphs.

iii. Road congestion is reducing bus performance and reliability. The project will make it worse.

- The EIS says traffic on ANZAC Bridge will increase by 2023 (p.8-103).
- Traffic modelling shows bus times will be slower into the city in the morning (p.3-19).
- The EIS identifies capacity constraints on ANZAC Bridge (p3-19). This project will dump more traffic onto the ANZAC Bridge.

iv. The EIS notes that the project design and land use forecasts have changed significantly since the Stage 2 and Stage 3 EIS. However the cumulative analysis does not quantify the expected change on those roads. The EIS only notes significant increases in traffic volumes.

v. 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)

vi. I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

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

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

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

Name: TOMAS BRAMBORA

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: 103/63 ENMORE ROAD

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

- Truck routes – Leichhardt: No trucks should be permitted on Darley Road or local roads in Leichhardt or Lilyfield. The EIS proposes that all trucks will arrive at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site from Haberfield and travel along Darley Road to the site, with a right-hand turn now permitted into James Street. The proposed route will result in a truck every 3-4 minutes for 5 years running directly by the small houses on Darley Road. These homes will not be habitable during the five-year construction period due to the unacceptable noise impacts. The truck noise will be worsened by their need to travel up a steep hill to return to the City West Link, so the noise impacts will affect not just those homes on or immediately adjacent to Darley Road. The proposal to run trucks so close to homes is dangerous and there have been two fatalities on Darley Road at the proposed site location. The EIS does not propose any noise or safety barriers to address this. Despite the unacceptable impact to nearby homes, there is no proposal for noise walls, nor any mitigation to individual homes.

- Noise mitigation – Leichhardt. The noise mitigation proposed in the EIS is unacceptable. No detail of noise walls is provided, giving residents no opportunity to comment on whether final impacts are acceptable. This is despite the fact 36 homes are identified in the EIS as severely affected by construction noise. The acoustic shed proposed is of the lowest grade and does not cover the entire site, resulting in noise impacts from the movement of trucks in and out of the tunnel access point. The highest grade acoustic shed should be provided, with the shed covering the entire site. The additional noise mitigation such as noise walls, need to be det out in detail so that residents can properly comment on the impacts.

- I am concerned that the AECOM, the company responsible for the EIS, always approves knocking down heritage buildings if the project requires it. It doesn't how much value it holds for the community, it must always be destroyed.

- The decision to build a three-stage tollway instead of expanding public transport has never been subjected to democratic decision-making and in fact has been opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages.

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

- The proposal for a permanent water treatment plant and substation to the south of the site on Darley Road will prevent direct pedestrian access to the light rail station. It will affect the future uses of the site once the project is completed. The facility is out of step with the area which is comprised of low rise homes and detracts from the visual amenity of the area. This site is a pedestrian hub and will be a visual blight for pedestrians, bike users and the homes that have direct line of sight to the facility. It should not be permitted on this site.

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: Monique Locca Signature:	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* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Address: 191 St Johns rd	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Suburb: Glebe Postcode 2037	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**

I. *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.*

II. *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.*

III. *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?*

IV. *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.*

V. *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.*

VI. *The EIS acknowledges that extra construction traffic will add to travel times across the Inner West and have a negative impact on businesses in the area. No compensation is suggested. These impacts are not been taken into account of evaluating the cost of WestCONnex.*

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

Name Monique Email moniquebabette.locca@gmail.com 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: Rodney Agius

Signature:

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

Address: 1/461 King St

Suburb: Newtown Postcode 2042

Submission to:

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- Night works – Leichhardt. The EIS states that to minimize disruptions to traffic on the existing road network (including in peak hours) there will be night works where appropriate. Given the congested nature of Darley Road, it is likely there will be frequent night work (EIS, 6.4). This will create an unnacceptable impact in residents. It is unacceptable that a highly unsuitable site has been selected. And, instead of a proper plan to manage traffic, the EIS contemplate work simply occurring at night. This is objected to in the strongest terms.

- The removal of Buruwan Park between The Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Parade, Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a direct loss of much-needed parkland in this inner city area. Further, Buruwan Park lies on a major cycle route from Railway Parade through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD.

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

- The EIS admits that air pollutants will exceed permitted levels along the Canal Rd used to access the St Peters Interchange because the traffic will be heavier. This is an unacceptable impact which will adversely affect vehicle users because it is known that people in their vehicles are not protected from the air pollution, as well as anyone on foot or cycling in the streets around the interchange. No amelioration is offered.

- The EIS states that investigation would be undertaken to confirm whether the Victoria Road bridge is a potential roost site for microbats. There will be attempts to 'manage potential impacts' if confirmed. This is inadequate. The project should not be permitted to impact on vulnerable species.

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

- I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

005457

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

23/9/17

Name: Patricia Kenny

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.

Date: 23/9/2017

Address: 271 Lilyfield Rd

Suburb: Lilyfield Postcode: 2040

I OBJECT TO THIS Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). My reasons are as follows.

There is a lack of strategic justification for the project. No feasible alternatives have been developed or assessed.

This EIS is a strategy-only document. It does not commit to any design and it therefore does not address any local impacts created by the proposed M4-M5 Link. Instead, it prepares the pathway for the sale of the Sydney Motorway Corporation (SMC) to the private sector, which would remove from the Government the responsibility, oversight and control of the final design, cost and implementation of the M4-M5 Link.

Importantly, the M4-M5 Link fails to meet the primary objectives of providing a direct motorway connection between Western Sydney and Sydney Airport and Port Botany.

While the Rozelle Interchange is supposed to be opened in December 2023, the design is so preliminary and so complex (and would be incredibly expensive if it were to proceed) that it should be treated as a separate stage of the project to ensure that potential private sector funders are willing to invest in it.

There will be major impacts on the Anzac Bridge (projected 60% increase in daily traffic) and the CBD. The EIS forecasts major impacts on bus travel times and reliability.

The EIS does not adequately account for impacts on health and air quality. Very concerningly, it identifies an additional five (5) unfiltered ventilation stacks to be constructed in Rozelle/Lilyfield. Additionally, local surface roads will be widened and traffic volumes will increase – with associated increased air quality risks.

In summary, the EIS treats the public – our communities – with contempt. It offers no final design, no commitment to improved transport and only vague and unreliable traffic modelling.

If the M4-M5 Link proceeds, the people of the affected inner west suburbs – and indeed in wider Sydney – will have a highly destructive, intrusive motorway that escalating tolls will make extremely unpopular, and therefore avoided wherever possible. In turn, this will inevitably create traffic congestion in smaller, local streets.

I believe the real purpose of this EIS is to get NSW Government approval so that the opportunity to design, build, operate, maintain and put a toll on the road can be sold to private investors – a process completely outside of the scrutiny of the public (taxpayers) who will bear the ill-effects on their various communities for **decades** to come.

I call on the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this entire EIS and re-write it prior to any further work on the other sections of WestConnex continuing.

23.9.17

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: SHIRLEY BOYD

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: 4 VALLEY ST

Suburb: BALMAIN 2041 Postcode

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 in the 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.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: BRETT WEYMACK
	Address: 30 AUSTRALIA ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: CAMPERDOWN Postcode 2050
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

1. The business case for the project across the 3 stages failed to measure or account for the cost of any external impacts of this massive toll road project. This includes the impact of air pollution on human and environmental health; adding fossil fuel emissions thus contributing to 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.
2. Deciding to build a three-stage tollway of the scale and complexity proposed and that has never been built before is placing the community at great risk and at the same time risking billions of public monies and resources. I strongly object to that fact that this risk has never been subjected to democratic decision-making despite being opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages.
3. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity.
4. This EIS has been released only 14 days after submission of comments on the concept design closed and a report released after the EIS. It seems impossible that the community comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to be incorporated into the EIS in this time. This raises serious questions about the integrity of the entire EIS process.
5. I have strong objections to proceeding in the face of the unknown hazard associated with two different tunnelling operations taking place in close time and location - the tunnelling for the M4-M5 link and the proposed Sydney Metro tunnelling in the same area - Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond. The impact of this combined tunnelling is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the residences and buildings above, many of them very old and heritage listed. This is a serious community safety issue and residents who do experience damage will be caught between 2 separate contractors for repairs and compensation. No approval should be given
6. Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware Rd and Enmore Rd and though the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria. The increasing numbers of vehicles will mean more vehicle pollution in the area (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic).
7. The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the St Peters Interchange will increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds sends 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 impact is both dangerous and unacceptable.

The people living near St Peters Interchange neither asked for nor want the whole WestConnex project which will not contribute to the provision of long-term sustainable transport to meet the community needs. At the same time, we will have to live and work with the impact of multiple years of construction, heavy vehicle traffic, noise and pollution, and local disruption possible damage to homes and business premises. I call on the Minister for Planning to reject this project and demand that the government re-think the transport planning for the whole metropolitan area.

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

Name _____; Email:_____; Mobile: _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Hannah Sheils
	Address: 245 Belmont St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Alexandria Postcode 2015
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

- Other comments

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Sh Jkhd Velma Address: 2/59 Balmain Rd
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Velma
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. **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.
2. **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. The EIS needs to detail how this risk of crashes will be managed to an acceptable level, which it does not.
3. **Worker parking** – Leichhardt. There is provision in the EIS for only a dozen worker car parks and no provision for the 100 or so workers who will be permanently based at the Darley Road site for up to five years. A major construction site project should not be permitted in a neighbourhood area without allocated parking for **all** workers. No other business would be permitted to be established without this requirement being satisfied – why is it acceptable for this project? In addition, the EIS proposes the removal of 20 car spaces used by residents on Darley Road and will remove the 'kiss and ride' facility at the light rail stop. This will result in residents being unable to park in their own street and will increase noise impacts from workers doing shift changeovers 24 hours a day. The EIS needs to mandate the use of public transport or provide for workers to be bussed in if adequate allocated parking is not provided.
4. **Number of vehicle movements** – Leichhardt. The EIS states that there will be 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day during construction (5 years). There is no guarantee that these figures are accurate as they are indicative only. The effect of these movements will be drastically increased commuter times for anyone accessing the City West Link during peak periods. The Darley Road site is equally busy on Saturday and this is not accounted for or acknowledged in the EIS. The EIS should not permit this number of vehicle movements and should be rejected on this basis as there is no plan as to how this will be managed. Referring to a future traffic management plan is inadequate – there is no guarantee that any such plan will be able to manage this traffic impact to an acceptable level.
5. **Access routes** – Leichhardt. The EIS states that all construction vehicles will enter and leave via Darley Road. Although near the City West Link, Darley Rd abuts a large number of small, local streets and homes and streets near Darley Road will be impacted by a heavy vehicle movement every 3-4 minutes. This is an unacceptable impact. No heavy or light vehicle movements should be permitted on Darley Road whatsoever and an alternative route which does not involve Darley Road is the only route that should be approved.

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

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Maryanne Galea. Address: 48 Charles St.
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040.
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Galea.
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. I object to the planned acquisition of the Dan Murphys site on Darley Road for the creation of a civil and tunnel works site as it will create unacceptable noise impacts for the community and lead to traffic chaos, along with creating an increased risk of accidents to pedestrians and cycle users.
2. The substation and water treatment plant proposed for Darley Road should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link so that it is less visible to residents. There are no homes that will have direct line of site of the facility if it is moved. This will also enable direct pedestrian access to the light rail without the need to use the winding path at the rear of the site which creates safety issues and adds to the time required to access the light rail stop.
3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the acknowledged constraints of the Darley Rd 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, as pertains to the Darley Road site, needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads.
4. At the conclusion of the construction period, the Darley Road 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 approval conditions need to mandate that the Darley Rd site is to be preserved as green space or other community purposes at the conclusion of the construction period.
5. No trucks (heavy or light) should be permitted on any streets adjacent to Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street). A blanket prohibition should be in force with respect to any worker vehicles from the construction site parking on these local streets. These homes will already suffer the worst construction impacts and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and the additional noise impacts of additional cars on their street. These local streets are not designed to handle heavy vehicle movements. Therefore, any approval conditions need to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all local streets adjacent to Darley Road.
6. Any approval conditions and the relevant construction contracts must require that all workers to the Darley Rd site are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail, with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads adjacent to the Darley Road site. The site currently provides only 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.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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: Dr. Carole Hungerford

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: 461 Darling 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 consultants for the Social and Economic Impact study is HillPDA. This company has a conflict of interest and is not an appropriate choice to do a social impact study of WestCONnex. Amongst its services it offers property valuation services and promotes property development in what are perceived to be strategic locations. HillPDA were heavily involved in work leading to the development of Urban Growth NSW and the heavily criticised Parramatta Rd Study. It is not in the public interest to use public funds on an EIS done by a company that has such a heavy stake in property development opportunities along the Parramatta Rd corridor. One of the advantages of property development along Parramatta Rd that Hill PDA promotes on its website is the 33 kilometre WestCONnex.

- The proposal to run trucks so close to homes is dangerous. There have been two fatalities on Darley Road at the proposed site location. The EIS does not propose any noise or safety barriers to address this. Despite the unacceptable impact to nearby homes, there is no proposal for noise walls, nor any mitigation to individual homes.

- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

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

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: SADIE DUGDALE

Signature: SDugdale

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 Ashley 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 WestConnex route has changed significantly over time, even after the initial August 2013 Business Case was approved by the NSW Government but not made public. Therefore an Updated Business Case on an updated concept was published in 2015. SGS Economics and Planning undertook a detailed assessment of this and reached the following conclusions:

- Misrepresentation of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) as 1.71 when it was 1.64.
- The Business Case did not identify Stage 3 WestConnex, connecting the M4 to the M5, as a priority for "filling in the missing links in Sydney's motorway network".
- Modelling for post-2031 conditions was not undertaken, however benefits were assumed to continue until 2052.
- The transport modelling is likely to have underestimated the impact of extra traffic induced by the additional capacity, which would significantly reduce the BCR.
- The Business Case did not reflect global approaches to congestion management, such as transit investment and demand management.
- The Business Case suggested WestConnex would help renew Parramatta Road by reducing traffic on it, despite the modelling showing that many parts of it would carry more traffic, not less.
- Travel time savings are a key component of the positive BCR. A significant proportion of these supposed benefits arise from travel time savings were within the margin of error of modelling, or would be so small that motorists may not notice them (and therefore would not value them).
- Insufficient justification was provided for the significant travel time savings, and economic benefits, factored into the BCR for business and light commercial vehicles – for instance there was insufficient analysis of origins and destinations of these trips.
- The construction costs appear too conservative – if these increase, the BCR would reduce accordingly.
- Other costs were not accounted for, such as reduced amenity on urban development, loss of land for higher value activities, and the health costs of potentially reduced public transport use.
- In summary, SGS suggested that the actual BCR of the project could be less than 1:1, with NSW taxpayers exposed to the risk that the project may not succeed.

◊ The project fails to address its most fundamental objective of connecting to Port Botany, the genesis of the entire enterprise

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:** GRAHAM GREENLEAF **Signature:** *Please ~~Include~~ my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* **Address:** 70 PIPER ST **Suburb:** LILYFIELD **Postcode** 2040

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

I. **The EIS does not provide appropriate parking for the estimated 100 or so workers that the EIS states will ~~work every day at the site, while other equivalent sites~~ have allocated parking for such workers (Northcote Civil site (150)) and Parramatta Road East Civil site (140). It is also noted that the EIS provides for loss of 20 residential parks on Darley Road. Local streets are at capacity already because of the lack of off-street parking for many ~~residents and the Light Rail stop which means~~ that commuters use local streets. The EIS states that workers 'will be encouraged to use public transport.' the EIS needs to mandate that no trucks or construction vehicles are to park in local streets. There needs to be a requirement that is enforceable that workers use the ~~Light Rail stop which is adjacent to the site or a plan to~~ bus in workers**

II. **The EIS does not require an acoustic shed and states that 'Acoustic barriers and devices at the access tunnel entrances would be considered and implemented where ~~reasonable and feasible to minimise potential noise~~ impacts associated with out-of-hours works within the tunnels.'**

III. **The EIS contains no detail of the access tunnel from the Darley Road site to the mainline tunnel other than depicting the route. The approval conditions need to ensure that tunnelling is occurring at sufficient depth so as to not jeopardise the integrity of the homes and not create unacceptable vibration and noise impacts for James Street residents and those at adjacent streets. The approval conditions need to make clear the period of time for which the 'temporary' tunnel is to be used.**

IV. **The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what ~~is planned and cannot comment or input into those~~ plans. (Executive Summary xvi)**

V. **The EIS social an economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that ~~WestCONnex has already destroyed more than~~ 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.**

VI. **Light construction vehicle routes – the EIS acknowledges that these vehicles will use 'dispersed' routes (8-62). In ~~other words, construction vehicles will use and park~~ on local roads. The EIS does not propose any management as to which roads they use. The addition of 70-100 light vehicle movements day in Leichhardt will result in our small, congested streets, which are already at capacity and suffering parking shortages, will have the added ~~impact of workers travelling to and from the site and~~ parking in local streets. There will be rat running. The EIS should provide an agreed route (using arterial roads only) that can be used by all vehicles associated with the project.**

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:* GRAHAM GREENLEAF *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:* 70 PIPER ST *Suburb:* LILYFIELD *Postcode* 2040

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

a. I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. The government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

b. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters, Haberfield and Rozelle Interchanges will disrupt local transport networks including bus and active transport (walking and cycling).

c. I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

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

e. The Air quality data provided in the EIS is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.

f. The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it.This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement

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

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: Paul Clenaghan

Signature: P S Clenaghan

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

Address: 14 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 operational Green House Gas (GHG) assessment is based on the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3).This model has major flaws and the unreliable outputs of the model put into question the GHG assessment.

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

- Both the St Peters Active Recreation Area and the Rozelle Interchange Open Space are a false promise. Unless there is an agreement for construction and management these will be grassed wastelands with compromised amenity, adjoined by ventilation facilities in Rozelle, divided by above ground portals and difficult to access across busy roads

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

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

- Scientists have found that there is no safe level of air pollution. As pollution levels rise deaths and hospitalisations rise too. A thorough cost-benefit analysis that takes into account the health effects due to increased exposure is required.

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

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

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Shona Laura		
Address: 146 Bland St,	Suburb Ashbrook	Post Code 2045
Signature: Shona Laura		
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website ~~Yes~~ No	YES	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	Shona Laura	

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

Hours of operation

1. **I object** to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

2. **I object** to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

   The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

   'Spoil handling associated with tunnelling supported by the Darley Road civil and tunnel site would occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Spoil would be handled below ground wherever practicable to reduce the potential for amenity impacts in adjacent areas. Spoil handing at the surface outside standard day time construction hours would occur within an acoustic shed to manage potential amenity impacts. Spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours, between 7.00 am and 6.00 pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00 am and 1.00 pm on Saturdays.'

   The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

3. **I object** to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

   The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

   '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. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would be kept informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site.

   The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

4. **I object** to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

5. **I object** to the EIS because the proponent/contractor would only have to keep local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would have no right to limit works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. As we have seem with other stages of WestConnex this leads to devastating impacts for residents who must endure significant periods of exposure to out of hours works which involve noise, lights and disturbance.

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

Name: Lindy Gorecki

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: 59 Premier St

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- *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).*

- *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 _____

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: Lydia Dahlen 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: 98 Boundary Rd Suburb: North Epping Postcode 2121

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

- SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware and Enmore Roads and through the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.
- The EIS at 12-57 describes potentially serious problems where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs. Why is SMC proposing tunnelling within metres of these critical services when no accurate surveying has been done? And when there is only limited information available about the strength of these water tunnels ? The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects ?
- There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.
- I object to the 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.

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

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

https://westconnexactiongroup.good.do/makeyoursubmissiontothewestconnexm4m5eis/Submission-to-WestConnex-New-M4M5/

Feedback on EIS for WestConnex M4-M5 Link (Application Number SSI 16_7485)

Thank you for the opportunity to give my feedback on the EIS for WestConnex M4-M5 Link. I oppose the project and outline my major concerns below, particularly those related to Rozelle Public School (the School) as a sensitive receptor.

Ventilation: Air pollution

WestConnex proposes unfiltered tunnel ventilation outlets of unknown heights: one approximately 250m northwest and three others approximately 700m south of the School. At present there is insufficient detail or evidence of analysis to determine the impact to the children at the School. Please provide the following:

- An analysis of current traffic volumes at 9am, noon and 3pm on Victoria Road adjacent to the school, and projected traffic analysis for school days both on Victoria Road adjacent to the School, and for both a tolled and toll-free Iron Cove Link tunnel adjacent to the School, at 9am, noon and 3pm, by commercial and non-commercial vehicle type,
- Evidence of current air pollution levels at the School from 9am, noon and 3pm for all school days in the past year, and the projected levels of air pollution at the School post-construction at 9am, noon and 3pm on day one, year one, year five and year ten, including carcinogenic diesel particulates, PM 2.5 particulates, and any other relevant measurement,
- Details of the prevailing wind and other relevant weather conditions at the School for each day in the past year,
- The final design of the 4 ventilation shafts proposed for Rozelle, including the height, diameter, façade and exact location, and a commitment that all ventilation shafts in Rozelle will be filtered for PM2.5,

Air pollution, noise and vibration during construction

Four to five years of construction works is proposed, including work as close to the School as Wellington Street, constructing the Iron Cove Link tunnel entrance and exit on Victoria Road approximately 250m from the School, with tunnelling work (and activities to support tunnelling) will be 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

I am very concerned that this will mean our children will be badly affected in some way by poor air quality, noise and vibration during 24/7 construction for four to five years - potentially the rest of their entire primary school education - during the entire time that our children are present on school grounds or at home.

Please provide a construction plan to include specific commitments and plans to:

- Limit negative impacts on our children's abilities to learn and play during these times,
- Eliminate noise at pre-school infants' nap-times and during tests at the School
- Minimise the impact of construction children's physical health, stress levels, and the impact on those with pre-existing respiratory conditions,
- Ensure children living within 500m of construction are able to receive full nights of sleep, as lack of sleep leads to tiredness and proven difficulty learning.

Soil pollution in construction

Please provide specific plans that ensure that construction will not cause the disturbance of lead and other toxic industrial pollutants known to be distributed in the soil throughout Rozelle and specific plans to eliminate the spread of soil contaminants throughout the surrounding area, including the School.

Safety and traffic management during construction and operation

At present there is insufficient traffic management detail to ensure the safety to the children at the School both during construction and operation. Please provide the following:

- A traffic plan concerning all roads and footpaths within 500m of the construction area, including but not limited to Victoria Road, Wellington Street, Merton Street and Darling Street which minimises risks to safety for road and footpath users, including buses, pedestrians and cyclists during construction due to temporary road arrangements or the close proximity of construction activities to normal traffic,
- Details of traffic modelling concerning all roads and footpaths within 500m of the construction area, including but not limited to Victoria Road, Wellington Street, Merton Street and Darling Street which minimises risks to safety for road users, including buses, pedestrians and cyclists during operation whilst the Iron Cove Link is toll-free, and if the Iron Cove Link is tolled in future, including any potential rat runs created by road users avoiding tolls,
- A traffic plan to maximise our children's health and safety and ability to walk to and participate in important School events, such as the School cross country and athletics carnival, normally held at King George's Park, and the School swim carnival at Drummoyne pool,
- Details of the impacts on bus routes and stops, and cycle paths and footpaths within 500m of construction, including but not limited to Victoria Road during construction and operation,
- Details on access to King George's Park and the Bay Run by road users, cyclists and pedestrians during construction and operation.

Other major concerns I have include:

For the sake of our community, our families, and our children, I hope you will be able to consider and address these important concerns.

Yours Sincerely,

Signature: Saal

I allow / do not allow for my personal details to be published.

I have not made a reportable political donation over $1000 in the past 2 years.

Name: LINDA ARNOLL

Address: 1/658 DARLING STREET

Email:

From: [redacted]
Sent: Mon, 16 Oct 2017 00:02:24 +0000
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Submission Details for Kevin Tory of Private (object)

From: system@accelo.comOn Behalf OfKevin Tory
Sent: Monday, 16 October 2017 11:02:02 AM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney
To: [redacted]
Subject: Submission Details for Kevin Tory of Private (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Kevin Tory
Organisation: Private ()
[redacted]

Address:
[redacted]

ROZELLE, NSW
2039

Content:
SUBMISSION OF OBJECTIONS TO EIS FOR WESTCONNEX M4//M5 LINK

I strongly object to the the WestConnex M4-M5 link EIS. I believe the project will worsen the traffic situation in the inner city area and better public transport infrastructure is what is required. But most of all, I am shocked that the health of residents in the Rozelle area seems to be mercilessly sacrificed to this project. Additionally, no form of compensation or reasonable alternative appears to be offered.

The proposed project would be the largest infrastructure to be built for cars in the Southern Hemisphere. The M4-M5 link, the Iron Cove Tunnel, and the Cross Harbour Tunnel would culminate in the inner west at the Rozelle Interchange. There would be several tunnels of 6 lanes each, with entry and exit portals necessitating cars queuing, accelerating and decelerating; adding quantities of exhaust to the accumulated car exhaust from the tunnels being released into the atmosphere from 3 unfiltered air stacks.

The Education Minister Rob Stokes said in 2017 that "no ventilation shafts will be built near any school". There are at least 5 schools around the area of the Interchange, and the popular Easton Park with its children's playground and many sports activities, would be almost opposite. At the very least, these air stacks should be filtered.

Professor Paul Torzillo, Head of Respiratory Medicine at RPA Hospital has condemned the unfiltered stacks as irresponsible, and the World Health Organisation has declared diesel particulates from trucks as carcinogenic. At the very least these air stacks should be filtered.

Additionally Rozelle, around the proposed Interchange, is a valley. The pollution from these unfiltered air stacks on still days will not be dispersed into the atmosphere, but just hang in the area. At the very least

these air stacks should be filtered.

Rozelle is heavily residential, full of young families, but also older people who have lived much of their lives in the area. Difficult now for them to relocate away from their support networks, to escape the polluted air and ongoing stress from the 5 years of disruption while the project is being built. The EIS just does not adequately account for the physical and mental health impacts of the project.

I am also concerned that the EIS does not appear to guarantee that the 10 hectares of green space that is promised to be built in the vicinity of the Rozelle Goods Yards, will stay as green space, and not be used for buildings of any sort, apartments, parking etc. This green space should be dedicated to parkland only and be densely planted with trees to assist with improving the air quality.

I also strongly object to the very shallow tunnelling proposed under houses close to the Rozelle Interchange. The EIS states that shallow tunnelling could cause damage to properties due to settlement of up to 35 millimetres. There is no indication of any compensation to residents for the constant stress of possible property damage, nor for anxiety and depression about the degradation of their financial investment in what was once a quiet residential location.

I also have a concern that the EIS does not indicate measures to protect local roads from becoming rat runs from drivers avoiding tolls or from those who simply dislike driving in tunnels.

I would also like to see a guarantee that Denison Street, Rozelle, which will be near the promised 10 hectare park, will not be widened for any future needs, including parking or access to the new park.

If the project proceeds, strict measures must be in place to ensure that WestConnex workers avoid driving trucks on local roads and that they park their vehicles only in specifically allocated areas.

I would appreciate a written reply to the objections as raised in my submission in regards to the health impacts - both physical and mental - of the project, compensation, unfiltered air stacks, a guarantee that the 10 hectares of green space will not be used for anything other than parkland, why such shallow tunnelling under residences & compensation, and what measures are being taken to protect local roads such as Denison Street, Rozelle, from rat running, and that this Street should not be widened for any future purpose.

[redacted]
Submission: Online Submission from Kevin Tory of Private (object)
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=227989

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247

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: W J O'Neal

Signature:

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

Address: 2/13 Campbell St.

Suburb: Balmain Postcode 2041

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

- The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. It relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.

- 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 valve it holds for the community, it must always be destroyed.

- 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.

- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downplays concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. The raises the question of whether this is a result of the failure of SMC to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters about the potential impacts of the M4 M5

- Many homes around the Rozelle Rail Yards and the Crescent Civil site will be noise affected, some will be highly noise affected. The expected duration of the cumulative works is 120 weeks, almost 3 years, when noise impact will be significant so it is essential that maximum noise mitigation measures are put in place. However the EIS contains only vague details of how mitigation will be carried out. There is no requirement that measures will in fact be carried out to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain specific noise mitigation measures, that can be mandated and enforced. Areas that will be particularly highly noise affected are Bayview Crescent and Railway Parade, the Northern end of Rail Yard site and sections of Lilyfield Rd, Hornsey St, Quirk St and Robert St. Given their proximity, receivers located along Lilyfield Rd between Victoria Road and Gordon St which overlook the Rozelle Yards are likely to experience the greatest construction noise impact within the whole Rozelle area.

- I object to unfiltered smokestacks in close densely populated areas. It is criminal

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: SEBAN TUNOR

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 GIFFS ST

Suburb: BELMORE Postcode: 2194

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 Parramatta Road Urban Transformation project has been put on hold by the NSW Government for a number of reasons, including the uncertainties relating to traffic capacity on Parramatta Road following the construction of WestConnex. To claim this as a benefit is misleading. The project predicts increased traffic congestion on Parramatta Road without the transformation, which clearly is not a benefit, and potentially funnels traffic unable to penetrate the corridor into the privately operated toll road.

- The EIS is a strategy document only. It does not commit to any design, and therefore it doesn't address any local issues which are created by the construction of the M4-M5 link. Its whole purpose is to prepare a legal and bureaucratic pathway for the sale of Sydney Motor Corporation to the private sector thereby removing the Government from the oversight and responsibility for the design and construction. It also endeavours to lock out the public from being able to have any say in what is built, how it is built and where it is built.

- The Rozelle Rail Yard stacks are stated to be 38m high and are situated in a valley area. The majority of Balmain Road is 39m above sea level and Annandale St is at 29m above sea level. Both are considerably less than 1 kilometre from the Rail Yard stacks so pollution will be blown directly into many homes in these areas. This will expose the residents of Annandale, Lilyfield, Rozelle and Balmain to highly increased health risks.

- 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 almost opposite Rozelle Primary School. 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. Recently built tunnels in Tokyo successfully filter 98% of all pollutants. There are at least 5 schools and childcare centres in close proximity to these pollution stacks.

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

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

Name: [illegible]

Signature: [illegible]

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: [illegible]

Suburb: [illegible] 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 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.

⇒ 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 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.

⇒ 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 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: Lewis Allen

Signature:

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

Address: 22/29 Cook 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

- The City West Link Eastbound AM and PM peak hour and other locations."Table 7-19 shows that several locations are forecast to exceed theoretical roadway capacity with the increased background traffic and the construction traffic in the 2021 AM and PM peak hours. However, traffic on the majority of these roads would exceed their theoretical capacity even without the construction traffic, simply due to the growth in background traffic". So in the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, massive amounts of construction traffic are going to be added for the whole construction period of 5 years. Even on completion it is stated in the EIS that traffic will be worse in this area than 'without the project'. This categorically shows that the planning of Westconnex is totally inadequate and needs major changes. It also shows that when completed Westconnex will not work. It is abundantly obvious that Rail/Metro is the only option to radically overhaul Sydney's failed transport systems

- I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.

- 2 G Appendix P Table 5-27 of the EIS states that 43% of the Leichhardt- Glebe Precinct travel to work by Car, 21% by Bus and 5%by Rail. These are figures for 2011. These figures are being used to promote the project and suggest they are accurate today. In the case of Rail these figures are extremely questionable. The Light Rail is now hugely popular, it's use having grown enormously. It is travelling at full capacity at Peak hours. More services are being put in place. Apartment blocks are being built as close to the Light Rail corridor as possible. Residents see the Light Rail as an efficient, reliable and timely method of commuting to work. It is blatantly obvious that the Govt should be investing heavily in building and extending Light Rail, Metro and Rail. If this were pursued in a professional manner the necessity for trying to hoodwink the community into believing that Westconnex were needed would be totally unnecessary.

- The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.

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: RICHARD HODGE

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: 69 REYNOLD ST

Suburb: BALMAIN Postcode 2041

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 Rozelle Interchange will prevent major redevelopment in the Rozelle area. This area has been identified by the NSW Government as a major opportunity for urban renewal for over 20 years. Light construction vehicle routes – the EIS acknowledges that these vehicles will use 'dispersed' routes (8-62). In other words, construction vehicles will use and park on local roads. The EIS does not propose any management as to which roads they use.

- The addition of 70-100 light vehicle movements day in Leichhardt will result in our small, congested streets, which are already at capacity and suffering parking shortages, will have the added impact of workers travelling to and from the site and parking in local streets. There will be rat running. The EIS should provide an agreed route (using arterial roads only) that can be used by all vehicles associated with the project.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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. Fine particulate matter is linked with Asthma, Lung Disease, Cancer, Stroke and poor lung development in children. Those most at risk are the old, the young and the unborn of pregnant women.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: RICHARD HODGE
	Address: 69 REYNOLD ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: BALMAIN Postcode 2041
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

- *The M4-M5 Link enables the expansion of the WestConnex network to include the Western Harbour Tunnel, Beaches Link and M6. These motorway projects, were not part of the WestConnex business case and are not priority projects in any State or Federal roads plan.*

- *The business case is fatally flawed in a number of ways :*
  - *It does not factor in the impact of longer total journey lengths on urban sprawl, which will have a flow-cost for infrastructure and servicing.*
  - *It includes benefits from WestConnex supporting more compact commercial land use when this is generally not the result of motorway investment, and is unlikely to be in the area served by Stage 3.*
  - *It does not attempt to cost the reductions in public transport, especially the loss of fare revenue.*
  - *Ancillary road projects necessitated by WestConnex, such as the potentially $1BN Alexandria-Moore Park Connectivity Upgrade, should have been included in the Business Case.*
  - *Impact on property values, costs of noise during construction, and loss of business should all have been costed and included in the Business Case*
  - *Loss of heritage to the whole community (not just property owners) should have been included in the Business Case.*

- *The Government is spending many billions of taxpayer dollars via Metro Rail to try and free itself of the restrictions of the City Circle that imposes a choke on the whole rail network, but is now replicating a the city circle with a 60km road network. It does makes sense to focus a rail network on the centre of the densest employment and residential area of Australia, with the greatest economic output per square kilometre. However, it is the antithesis of common sense, practicality, economic productivity, property value creation, environmental planning, social planning and basic transport planning to replicate it with more motorways.*

- *The Business Case for the WestConnex project (made up of the New M4, Iron Cove Link and Rozelle Interchange, M4-M5 Link, New M5, King Georges Road Interchange upgrade and Sydney Gateway was not adequate to justify moving to environmental impact assessment.*

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: JENNIFER BASKER

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 [redacted] LAWSON 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 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.

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

Name: JENNIFER BASKER

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 LAWSON 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 high tolls are set to increase for decades by the CPI or by 4% a year, whichever is higher. When inflation is low and wages are not even keeping up with low inflation this is outrageous. And it is not as if the commuters or workers of western Sydney have a real alternative in public transport. This is just gouging western Sydney road users to make the road attractive to a buyer

- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective.

- The EIS admits that drivers from lower income households are more likely to travel longer distances to avoid tolls because of the cost. So you either pay the high tolls (capped at $7.95 in 2015 dollars) or you drive for longer to avoid the tolls. We have seen this already where commuters have chose to drive on Parramatta rd not the new M4 with the new tolls. This is unfair.

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

- The 2023 'cumulative' modelling scenario includes the Sydney Gateway and the western harbour tunnel but neither of these projects are currently committed and it is highly unlikely they will be completed by this date. This raises the question of why did the proponent adopt such a misleading position and how does it affect the impacts stated?

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

- This EIS contains no meaningful design and construction details and no parameters as to how broad changes and therefore impacts could be. It therefore fails to allow the community to be informed about and comment on the project impacts in a meaningful way.

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

Name: LAURE AZNAVOORIAN

Signature: Laure Aznavoorian

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: 323a DARLING

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 Project will have significant impacts on the streets near on- and off-ramps. Modelling shows that the Anzac Bridge will have 60% more traffic in 2033 because of the Project.

- The modelling assuming journey time shifting when mode shifting is more likely.

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

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

- The management of water in the Rozelle Yards is of great concern as the site is highly contaminated and the construction work that will be carried out will cause a great deal of disturbance especially once vegetation has been removed. There will be potential impacts from contaminated soils, leakage/spills of hydrocarbons and other chemicals from machinery, vehicles transporting spoil adjacent to roads and stormwaters, rinse water from plant washing and concrete slurries. Water from tunnelling activity and other works will also introduce contaminants. The EIS says that much of this water will be treated in temporary treatment facilities and sediment tanks before being released to Whites Creek and Rozelle Bay. The EIS does not disclose what levels of pollution controls will be implemented to make sure that contaminated water is not released into White's Creek or Rozelle Bay. This is not acceptable.

- The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction.(Executive Summary xviii)

- Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)

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

Name: CAROLYN NEWMAN

Signature: C. Newman

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: 12/18 Nicholson St.

Suburb: Balmain East 2041 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 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 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.

- 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.

- 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 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.

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** Rodney Pratt
	Address: 5 Tristania Grove
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** Greenacre **Postcode** 2190
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:** Pratt
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

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

1. 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.

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

3. 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.

4. Why is there no detailed information about the so called 'King Street Gateway' included in the EIS ?

5. An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow 'swoosh' that is upwaOrds of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be 'encouraged' to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that 'definitive' rather than 'indicative' alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair 'definitive' document open for genuine public comment.

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

Name: W R QUEALY

Signature: W R Queally

*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: 406/28 WARAMA PL

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 Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The Rozelle interchange has an unprecedented concentration of stacks, in a valley, adjacent to densely populated suburbs. The interchange has steep and long climbs, increasing emissions concentrations, which will then be pumped into the surrounding area. The modelling does not account for stop-start conditions. However, the EIS shows significant traffic volumes heading onto the Anzac Bridge, which already operates at the lowest Level of Service (F) in peak times. There will be significant queues heading into the tunnels, greatly increasing the level of emissions. The existing M5 in peak conditions may provide a more realistic base line.

- 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). OEH needs to provide information about the value of this standard and on the impact of new motorways on that level.

- In view of the above no tunnelling less than 35m in depth from the surface to the crown of a tunnel (ie the top) under residences should be contemplated let alone undertaken. And of course no tunnelling should be undertaken under sensitive sites.

- 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.

- The analysis shows Anzac Bridge/Western Distributor is currently at or close to capacity, particularly in the AM peak where existing operational and geometric features of the road network limit the capacity. The EIS notes that under all scenarios the Project will generate significant additional traffic on these links, requiring major and costly additional motorway infrastructure to the CBD. This is despite the fact that the NSW Government recognises that there is no capacity to accommodate additional car trips to the CBD and all its policies aim to allocate more street space to public transport, walking and cycling. The EIS must assess and identify any upgrades that the Project will cause or require. (App H p. xxxiii)

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: Sally Smith Signature: Smith *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 6 MORT ST Suburb: BALMAIN Postcode 2041	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 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 Rozelle and Iron Cove interchanges are not to meet the project objective of linking M4 East and New M5 (Part 3.3 of EIS) and should not be included in the Project. Existing motorways (Cross City Tunnel and Eastern Distributor) would provide suitable road capacity to avoid the city centre.*

◊ *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.*

◊ *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 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.*

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: Vanessa James

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: 74/8 Wade St

Suburb: Birchgrove *Postcode* 2041

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.*

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Sarah vd Westhuizen

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: 51 Curtis Rd

Suburb: Balmain Postcode 2041

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.

- There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be date. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.

- 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.

- This EIS provides no basis on which to approve such a complex project including the building of interchanges underneath Sydney suburbs Rozelle and Leichhardt. It would be absurd to approve the building of up to three tunnels under people's homes on the basis of such flimsy information

- The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link – in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area – in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other. The increasing numbers of vehicles will also increase the vehicle pollution (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic) in this area.

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

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: D. POLJAK Signature: *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 7 Malwen Ave Suburb: CROYDON Postcode: 2132	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**

- *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.*

- *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.*

- *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 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)*

- *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 Rozelle and Iron Cove interchanges are not to meet the project objective of linking M4 East and New M5 (Part 3.3 of EIS) and should not be included in the Project. Existing motorways (Cross City Tunnel and Eastern Distributor) would provide suitable road capacity to avoid the city centre.*

- *The Western Sydney Airport is due to commence construction next year with completion in 2026. Demand for air travel in Sydney is set to double over the next 20 years. Initial patronage is said to be 10 million passengers per year. Information should be provided demonstrating how (or whether) the project caters for travel to the new airport and the likely lessening of demand to the current monopoly airport.*

- *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.*

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Tanuja Das.
	Address: 29 Dangar Place.
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Chippendale Postcode 2008.
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

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

- Given that the modelling for air quality is based on the traffic modelling, which, as shown above, is fundamentally flawed, and given poor air quality has a significant health impact the EIS should not be approved until an independent scientifically qualified reviewer has analysed the stated air quality outcomes and identified any deficits

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

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

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

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

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: Matt Stratford Signature: *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 37/679 Bourke St Suburb: Surry Hills Postcode 2010	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.

a. 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.

b. 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.

c. 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.

d. 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.

e. The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. It relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.

f. 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.

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: Dzenis Burzic Signature: dzb *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 14/55 Cambridge St Suburb: Inner West Postcode 2166	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..

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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: Peter Hartley
	Address: 16/14 Avona Ave
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Glebe Postcode 2037
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

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

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director
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: G lynn James

Signature:

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

Address: 2 Centre St

Suburb: Bensville *Postcode* 2251

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* _____

Submission to Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
Application Number: SSI 7485
Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I wish to register my strong objection to Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link), particularly in relation to NW Rozelle. My reasons are set out below:

1. CAR PARKING CONGESTION & SAFETY ISSUES
It is stated that upgrades to the existing car park within King George Park will be implemented during construction, with around 30 carparking spaces being formalised (EIS 13.5.4). This is a well-used park, which accommodates up to at least 80 cars at any single sporting event on the weekend. Overflow cars usually spill into the side streets during the weekend. Reducing carparking to 30 spaces means that 50+ cars will be pushed into nearby 10k shared-zone local streets which are already crammed full with local residents cars. This is not feasible. Having so many cars circulating the shared-zones looking for parking is also dangerous for pedestrians, many of whom are children.

2. POLLUTION AND LOSS OF CAR PARKING SPACE
It is stated that a new bioretention facility at King George Park will be incorporated into the current carpark (EIS 13.5.4). It is unclear whether this facility is to be permanent or whether the water being pumped from the facility into Iron Cove will be filtered. It is not acceptable to pump toxic waste into Iron Cove. The biorentention facility is also taking up valuable parking space. See point 1 above.

3. SHARED-ZONE SAFETY ISSUES ON LOCAL ROADS
Clubb St is currently one of the main, and the widest access roads to KGP. Closing Clubb St (EIS Vol 1A Chapter 8 Traffic and Transport) will push traffic onto smaller side streets, which are shared zones. Diverting traffic to Callan and Springside as suggested is not feasible as both roads are extremely narrow with double-sided parking, as well as being shared zones. Two cars going in opposite directions cannot pass each other in Callan or Springside St. If the reduction of carparking space as KGP goes ahead (see point 1), traffic chaos will ensue as these cars navigate these narrow streets. There simply isn't the circulation capacity available to reduce parking or close roads.

4. LOSS OF PARKING SPACES IN LOCAL STREETS
On-street traffic parking for local residents is already at a premium. Residents are sometimes forced to park in Manning St and at KGP until a space becomes available nearer their homes, especially on the weekend during sporting events. There is also a high number of young children in this area, and parents need parking close to their homes to transport shopping and toddlers. Loss of any parking spaces in Toelle, Clubb and Callan Streets (EIS Vol 1A Chapter 8 Traffic and Transport)) is not feasible.

Name: [redacted]

Address: [redacted]

Postcode [redacted]

Signature: [redacted]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website YES / (NO)

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

Submission to Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
Application Number: SSI 7485
Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I wish to register my strong objection to WCX's proposed Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link), particularly in Rozelle. Reasons for my objection include:

1. TRUCK MOVEMENTS
42 heavy vehicle and 140 light vehicle movements a day from the Iron Cove civil site have been articulated in the EIS (Vol 1A Chapter 8 Traffic and Transport). It is not clear from the EIS whether the light vehicles will be carrying spoil. Also, no analysis of the magnitude of increased noise pollution for local residents has been included here.

2. TRAFFIC CONGESTION VICTORIA RD NORTH OF IRON COVE
Where the project would connect to the existing road network, increased congestion is forecast in parts of Mascot, along Frederick Street at Haberfield, Victoria Road north of Iron Cove Bridge, Johnston Street at Annandale and on the Western Distributor (EIS, Vol 1A Chapter 8 p103). This is a major problem that deserves more than a sentence, especially in relation to Iron Cove Bridge which is already congested at peak hour, and Saturday mornings. Weekend traffic is particularly congested at the Drummoyne end of Iron Cove bridge where cars are trying to access Birkenhead Shopping Centre. Cars are banked up along Victoria Rd to turn left into Park and Formosa Streets & Henley Marine Drive. Has any traffic modelling been done on this part of the road? What is the point of pouring 54,000 extra car movements a day through the tunnel onto ICB and a suburban shopping strip (Victoria Rd, Drummoyne) to create a bottleneck? The speed limit within the tunnel will be 80km/h. RMS "Speed Zoning Guidelines" limits before and after tunnel are 60km/h. This change in speed would surely have the potential to increase this bottleneck further when road usage is high. This is not acceptable.

3. PEDESTRIAN/RESIDENT AMENITY
The artist's impressions at Figures 7.39 and 13.37 (showing a view of the ventilation facility and pedestrians using the sidewalk) bear no relation to reality. Currently pedestrians try to avoid walking along this side of the road because it is too exposed to traffic. It is an extremely grimy area, especially between ICB and Terry St. Where is all the traffic in the drawings? Tunnel portals are also areas of high levels of pollution. It is totally unacceptable that residents will have to consider their health before walking outdoors, as well as being aesthetically challenged by the stack which is disproportionately high to the rest of the buildings in the area and will cast a shadow at some point over the footpaths and a number of local homes.

4. UNFILTERED SMOKE STACKS
It is totally unacceptable that the pollution stacks for Rozelle are unfiltered. There is no safe level of exposure to particulate matter of 2.5 microns and less. Recently built tunnels in Tokyo successfully filter 98% of all pollutants. Building the stack near Rozelle Public School is totally unacceptable as young children are the most vulnerable to pollution related disease. Building the stack near the Bay Run which people use for exercise is also unacceptable.

Name: Annie Wesley-Smith

Address: 74 Watkin St Newtown

Postcode 2042

Signature: AWS

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
YES / NO

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

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: ANNIE WESLEY-SMITH

Signature: PAWS

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: 74 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

- The Rozelle Rail Yard stacks are stated to be 38m high and are situated in a valley area. The majority of Balmain Road is 39m above sea level and Annandale St is at 29m above sea level. Both are considerably less than 1 kilometre from the Rail Yard stacks so pollution will be blown directly into many homes in these areas. This will expose the residents of Annandale, Lilyfield, Rozelle and Balmain to highly increased health risks.

- 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.

- 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 almost opposite Rozelle Primary School. 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. Recently built tunnels in Tokyo successfully filter 98% of all pollutants. There are at least 5 schools and childcare centres in close proximity to these pollution stacks.

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

Submission to Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
Application Number: SSI 7485
Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I wish to register my strong objection to Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link), particularly in relation to NW Rozelle. My reasons are set out below:

1. CAR PARKING CONGESTION & SAFETY ISSUES
It is stated that upgrades to the existing car park within King George Park will be implemented during construction, with around 30 carparking spaces being formalised (EIS 13.5.4). This is a well-used park, which accommodates up to at least 80 cars at any single sporting event on the weekend. Overflow cars usually spill into the side streets during the weekend. Reducing carparking to 30 spaces means that 50+ cars will be pushed into nearby 10k shared-zone local streets which are already crammed full with local residents cars. This is not feasible. Having so many cars circulating the shared-zones looking for parking is also dangerous for pedestrians, many of whom are children.

2. POLLUTION AND LOSS OF CAR PARKING SPACE
It is stated that a new bioretention facility at King George Park will be incorporated into the current carpark (EIS 13.5.4). It is unclear whether this facility is to be permanent or whether the water being pumped from the facility into Iron Cove will be filtered. It is not acceptable to pump toxic waste into Iron Cove. The biorentention facility is also taking up valuable parking space. See point 1 above.

3. SHARED-ZONE SAFETY ISSUES ON LOCAL ROADS
Clubb St is currently one of the main, and the widest access roads to KGP. Closing Clubb St (EIS Vol 1A Chapter 8 Traffic and Transport) will push traffic onto smaller side streets, which are shared zones. Diverting traffic to Callan and Springside as suggested is not feasible as both roads are extremely narrow with double-sided parking, as well as being shared zones. Two cars going in opposite directions cannot pass each other in Callan or Springside St. If the reduction of carparking space as KGP goes ahead (see point 1), traffic chaos will ensue as these cars navigate these narrow streets. There simply isn't the circulation capacity available to reduce parking or close roads.

4. LOSS OF PARKING SPACES IN LOCAL STREETS
On-street traffic parking for local residents is already at a premium. Residents are sometimes forced to park in Manning St and at KGP until a space becomes available nearer their homes, especially on the weekend during sporting events. There is also a high number of young children in this area, and parents need parking close to their homes to transport shopping and toddlers. Loss of any parking spaces in Toelle, Clubb and Callan Streets (EIS Vol 1A Chapter 8 Traffic and Transport)) is not feasible.

Name: Ivana Morangen

Address: 206 Lilyfield Road, Lilyfield

Postcode 2040

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website YES / NO

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

Submission to Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
Application Number: SSI 7485
Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I wish to register my strong objection to Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link), particularly in relation to NW Rozelle. My reasons are set out below:

1. CAR PARKING CONGESTION & SAFETY ISSUES
It is stated that upgrades to the existing car park within King George Park will be implemented during construction, with around 30 carparking spaces being formalised (EIS 13.5.4). This is a well-used park, which accommodates up to at least 80 cars at any single sporting event on the weekend. Overflow cars usually spill into the side streets during the weekend. Reducing carparking to 30 spaces means that 50+ cars will be pushed into nearby 10k shared-zone local streets which are already crammed full with local residents cars. This is not feasible. Having so many cars circulating the shared-zones looking for parking is also dangerous for pedestrians, many of whom are children.

2. POLLUTION AND LOSS OF CAR PARKING SPACE
It is stated that a new bioretention facility at King George Park will be incorporated into the current carpark (EIS 13.5.4). It is unclear whether this facility is to be permanent or whether the water being pumped from the facility into Iron Cove will be filtered. It is not acceptable to pump toxic waste into Iron Cove. The biorentention facility is also taking up valuable parking space. See point 1 above.

3. SHARED-ZONE SAFETY ISSUES ON LOCAL ROADS
Clubb St is currently one of the main, and the widest access roads to KGP. Closing Clubb St (EIS Vol 1A Chapter 8 Traffic and Transport) will push traffic onto smaller side streets, which are shared zones. Diverting traffic to Callan and Springside as suggested is not feasible as both roads are extremely narrow with double-sided parking, as well as being shared zones. Two cars going in opposite directions cannot pass each other in Callan or Springside St. If the reduction of carparking space as KGP goes ahead (see point 1), traffic chaos will ensue as these cars navigate these narrow streets. There simply isn't the circulation capacity available to reduce parking or close roads.

4. LOSS OF PARKING SPACES IN LOCAL STREETS
On-street traffic parking for local residents is already at a premium. Residents are sometimes forced to park in Manning St and at KGP until a space becomes available nearer their homes, especially on the weekend during sporting events. There is also a high number of young children in this area, and parents need parking close to their homes to transport shopping and toddlers. Loss of any parking spaces in Toelle, Clubb and Callan Streets (EIS Vol 1A Chapter 8 Traffic and Transport)) is not feasible.

Name: [redacted]

Address: [redacted]

[redacted] Postcode [redacted]

Signature: [redacted]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website YES / (NO)

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

Submission to Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
Application Number: SSI 7485
Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I wish to register my strong objection to WCX's proposed Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link), particularly in Rozelle. Reasons for my objection include:

The Business Case for the WestConnex project (made up of the New M4, Iron Cove Link and Rozelle Interchange, M4-M5 Link, New M5, King Georges Road Interchange upgrade and Sydney Gateway) is not adequate to justify moving to EIS.

While WCX 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. The EIS provides no information about changes in traffic volumes entering the Sydney CBD caused by WCX, and Iron Cove Bridge (earmarked for more traffic) is already at capacity twice a day.

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 impossible to form a properly informed understanding of the environmental impacts – the very purpose of the EIS.

The EIS for the M4-M5 Link is far too conceptual. It does not offer the apposite sureties with regard, for example, construction costs and traffic estimates, which are required (for a watertight EIS) to be within 10% (P10), not 50% (P50).

After this week's revelations (*SMH* 12/10/17) that the SMC has rejected the sole bid to construct the Rozelle Interchange, and that the RMS will take over from the SMC, re-assigning itself direct responsibility for key elements of the proposed M4-M5 Link, the entire EIS (already adjudged wanting in rigour and detail by many an expert) appears to be lurching toward 'relevance jeopardy'. Ticking off on an EIS in the midst of such design and management turmoil is surely unwise, perhaps illegal?

Approving an EIS for a potentially unbuildable Rozelle Interchange design may also provide the perfect 'cloak' under which to proceed with a St Peters-style *above-ground* interchange. An above-ground design would potentially see many more houses in Rozelle acquired and bulldozed. If the current EIS for the M4-M5 Link *was* signed off, the community would be powerless/voice-less to object to such a substitute proposal. This is unacceptable, and should invalidate the current EIS.

Name: William Vickers

Address: 4 Helena St

Lilyfield NSW Postcode 2040

Signature: [signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
YES / NO

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

Submission to Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
Application Number: SSI 7485
Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I wish to register my strong objection to WCX's proposed Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link), particularly in Rozelle. Reasons for my objection include:

1. TRUCK MOVEMENTS
42 heavy vehicle and 140 light vehicle movements a day from the Iron Cove civil site have been articulated in the EIS (Vol 1A Chapter 8 Traffic and Transport). It is not clear from the EIS whether the light vehicles will be carrying spoil. Also, no analysis of the magnitude of increased noise pollution for local residents has been included here.

2. TRAFFIC CONGESTION VICTORIA RD NORTH OF IRON COVE
Where the project would connect to the existing road network, increased congestion is forecast in parts of Mascot, along Frederick Street at Haberfield, Victoria Road north of Iron Cove Bridge, Johnston Street at Annandale and on the Western Distributor (EIS, Vol 1A Chapter 8 p103). This is a major problem that deserves more than a sentence, especially in relation to Iron Cove Bridge which is already congested at peak hour, and Saturday mornings. Weekend traffic is particularly congested at the Drummoyne end of Iron Cove bridge where cars are trying to access Birkenhead Shopping Centre. Cars are banked up along Victoria Rd to turn left into Park and Formosa Streets & Henley Marine Drive. Has any traffic modelling been done on this part of the road? What is the point of pouring 54,000 extra car movements a day through the tunnel onto ICB and a suburban shopping strip (Victoria Rd, Drummoyne) to create a bottleneck? The speed limit within the tunnel will be 80km/h. RMS "Speed Zoning Guidelines" limits before and after tunnel are 60km/h. This change in speed would surely have the potential to increase this bottleneck further when road usage is high. This is not acceptable.

3. PEDESTRIAN/RESIDENT AMENITY
The artist's impressions at Figures 7.39 and 13.37 (showing a view of the ventilation facility and pedestrians using the sidewalk) bear no relation to reality. Currently pedestrians try to avoid walking along this side of the road because it is too exposed to traffic. It is an extremely grimy area, especially between ICB and Terry St. Where is all the traffic in the drawings? Tunnel portals are also areas of high levels of pollution. It is totally unacceptable that residents will have to consider their health before walking outdoors, as well as being aesthetically challenged by the stack which is disproportionately high to the rest of the buildings in the area and will cast a shadow at some point over the footpaths and a number of local homes.

4. UNFILTERED SMOKE STACKS
It is totally unacceptable that the pollution stacks for Rozelle are unfiltered. There is no safe level of exposure to particulate matter of 2.5 microns and less. Recently built tunnels in Tokyo successfully filter 98% of all pollutants. Building the stack near Rozelle Public School is totally unacceptable as young children are the most vulnerable to pollution related disease. Building the stack near the Bay Run which people use for exercise is also unacceptable.

Name: [redacted]

Address: [redacted] 3/2 MUSGROVE ST

MOSMAN Postcode 2088

Signature: [redacted]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
YES / NO

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

Submission to Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
Application Number: SSI 7485
Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I wish to register my strong objection to Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link), particularly in relation to NW Rozelle. My reasons are set out below:

1. CAR PARKING CONGESTION & SAFETY ISSUES
It is stated that upgrades to the existing car park within King George Park will be implemented during construction, with around 30 carparking spaces being formalised (EIS 13.5.4). This is a well-used park, which accommodates up to at least 80 cars at any single sporting event on the weekend. Overflow cars usually spill into the side streets during the weekend. Reducing carparking to 30 spaces means that 50+ cars will be pushed into nearby 10k shared-zone local streets which are already crammed full with local residents cars. This is not feasible. Having so many cars circulating the shared-zones looking for parking is also dangerous for pedestrians, many of whom are children.

2. POLLUTION AND LOSS OF CAR PARKING SPACE
It is stated that a new bioretention facility at King George Park will be incorporated into the current carpark (EIS 13.5.4). It is unclear whether this facility is to be permanent or whether the water being pumped from the facility into Iron Cove will be filtered. It is not acceptable to pump toxic waste into Iron Cove. The biorentention facility is also taking up valuable parking space. See point 1 above.

3. SHARED-ZONE SAFETY ISSUES ON LOCAL ROADS
Clubb St is currently one of the main, and the widest access roads to KGP. Closing Clubb St (EIS Vol 1A Chapter 8 Traffic and Transport) will push traffic onto smaller side streets, which are shared zones. Diverting traffic to Callan and Springside as suggested is not feasible as both roads are extremely narrow with double-sided parking, as well as being shared zones. Two cars going in opposite directions cannot pass each other in Callan or Springside St. If the reduction of carparking space as KGP goes ahead (see point 1), traffic chaos will ensue as these cars navigate these narrow streets. There simply isn't the circulation capacity available to reduce parking or close roads.

4. LOSS OF PARKING SPACES IN LOCAL STREETS
On-street traffic parking for local residents is already at a premium. Residents are sometimes forced to park in Manning St and at KGP until a space becomes available nearer their homes, especially on the weekend during sporting events. There is also a high number of young children in this area, and parents need parking close to their homes to transport shopping and toddlers. Loss of any parking spaces in Toelle, Clubb and Callan Streets (EIS Vol 1A Chapter 8 Traffic and Transport)) is not feasible.

Name: Alex Fox

Address: 10/30-32 St Georges Cres
Drummoyne Postcode

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website YES / NO

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

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: MARGARET PATTERSON Address: 78 HILL ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LEICHHARDT Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Margaret Patterson
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 has many caveats and depends upon further steps (such as traffic management plans), the detail of which is not provided. The community has no certainty that any of the impacts from construction will be managed to an acceptable level.
3. 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.
4. The EIS states that there may be a 'small increase in pollutant concentrations' near surface roads. The EIS states that potential health impacts associated with changes in air quality (specifically nitrogen dioxide and particulates) within the local community have been assessed and are considered to be 'acceptable.' We disagree that the impacts on human health are acceptable and object to the project in its entirety because of these impacts. (Executive Summary xvi)
5. 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)
6. There are 36 homes identified as having severe noise impacts during construction in Leichhardt and Lilyfield. No noise barriers have been identified so residents are unable to comment as to whether this impact will be reduced. No proposal for alternative accommodation is provided. This is unacceptable and all of the proposed noise mitigation options should be detailed in the EIS so that residents have an opportunity to comment on what is proposed. (Executive Summary xvii)
7. There is no plan to manage traffic on Darley Road proposed in the EIS. This critical arterial road is regularly congested at peak periods. Reference in the EIS to developing a traffic management plan in the future is not acceptable. The detail of what is proposed needs to be contained in the EIS so that residents can assess whether the impact of 170 light and heavy vehicle movements a day in and out of the site can be acceptably managed.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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: MARGARET PATERSON
	Address: 78 HILL ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: WEICHHARDT Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Margaret Patterson
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. I object to the planned acquisition of the Dan Murphys site on Darley Road for the creation of a civil and tunnel works site as it will create unacceptable noise impacts for the community and lead to traffic chaos, along with creating an increased risk of accidents to pedestrians and cycle users.
2. The substation and water treatment plant proposed for Darley Road should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link so that it is less visible to residents. There are no homes that will have direct line of site of the facility if it is moved. This will also enable direct pedestrian access to the light rail without the need to use the winding path at the rear of the site which creates safety issues and adds to the time required to access the light rail stop.
3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the acknowledged constraints of the Darley Rd 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, as pertains to the Darley Road site, needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads.
4. At the conclusion of the construction period, the Darley Road 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 approval conditions need to mandate that the Darley Rd site is to be preserved as green space or other community purposes at the conclusion of the construction period.
5. No trucks (heavy or light) should be permitted on any streets adjacent to Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street). A blanket prohibition should be in force with respect to any worker vehicles from the construction site parking on these local streets. These homes will already suffer the worst construction impacts and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and the additional noise impacts of additional cars on their street. These local streets are not designed to handle heavy vehicle movements. Therefore, any approval conditions need to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all local streets adjacent to Darley Road.
6. Any approval conditions and the relevant construction contracts must require that all workers to the Darley Rd site are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail, with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads adjacent to the Darley Road site. The site currently provides only 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.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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: MARGARET PATTERSON Address: 78 HILL ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: ECHHARDT Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Margaret Patterson
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 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 of 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.
3. The impacts in the EIS are misleading because they do not include any detail of the cumulative impact caused by the overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 (of up to one year). 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 multiple WestConnex projects. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure. Nor does the EIS provide for any traffic management to prevent rat running during the period of construction, when Stages 1 and 2 have opened. The EIS should not be approved without this detail and adequate plans to manage this impact.
4. 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)
5. The EIS states that all vegetation on the Darley Road site will be removed. This includes a mature large tree which provides a visual and noise barrier from the City West Link. The tree should not be permitted to be removed.
6. Despite the fact the EIS identifies over 30 homes with severe noise impacts, no mitigation is mandated. While the possibility of noise walls is flagged, along with in-home treatments, none of this is a requirement. Nor is any detail provided on which residents or business owners can comment. No noise barriers have been proposed. This is unacceptable and appropriate noise barriers should be included in the EIS for consideration. (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 _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: MARGARET PATTERSON
	Address: 78 HILL ST.
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb LEICHHARDT Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Margaret Patterson
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. 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 _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: MARGARET PATERSON
	Address: 78 Hill St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: WEICHHARDT Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Margaret Paterson
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. I object to the selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.

2. I object to the proposal that 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day will occur at this site. This will create an unacceptable risk to pedestrians and bicycle users. The EIS should not permit any truck movements near the Darley Road site. The alternative proposal which provides that all spoil trucks enter and leave from the City West link is the only proposal that should be considered. The EIS does not mention that 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.

3. I object to the location of a permanent substation and water treatment plant following the completion of the project on the Darley Road site. This will limit the future uses of the land and the community has been continually assured that the land, which is Government-owned, would be available for community purposes. The presence of this facility will forever prevent the ability for safe and direct pedestrian access to the light rail stop, with users required to walk down a dark and winding path. It will also limit the future use of the site. If a permanent facility is to be located then it should be moved to the north of the site so that it is out of sight of homes and has less visual impact on residents.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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 _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: MARGARET PATERSON
	Address: 78 HILL ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LEICHHARDT Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Margaret Patterson
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. I object to the planned acquisition of the Dan Murphys site on Darley Road for the creation of a civil and tunnel works site.
2. The Darley Road site has many issues which make tunneling at this point an unacceptable risk, including that it is in a flood zone. This proposal will worsen the existing flooding risk. The mitigation suggested in the EIS is not adequate.
3. The EIS states that property damage will occur due to ground movement may occur. The EIS states that 'settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment'. The proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres.
4. The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This approach deprives residents of any ability to comment on the detailed designs. (Executive Summary xvi)
5. The EIS does not mention the impact of aircraft noise and its cumulative impact. Therefore, noise levels identified in the EIS are misleading. The EIS states there will be at least 10 weeks of severe noise impacts during the time that Dan Murphys is demolished and the road prepared. I object to the selection of the Darley Road site because of the unacceptable noise impacts it will have on surrounding homes and businesses, with at least 36 homes identified as suffering extreme noise interference for this initial 10-week period.
6. The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the Darley Road site which includes several mature trees. I object to the removal of these trees which create a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the trees are removed they must be replaced with mature trees as soon as the remediation of the site commences.
7. There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be safe. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.
8. 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 to be located on this site.

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

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: MARGARET PATTERSON Address: 78 HILL ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LEICHHARDT Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Margaret Patterson
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

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

1. I object to the selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.

2. The period of construction proposed is unacceptably long. Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years while the EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This period creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.

3. The noise impacts of construction are not able to be mitigated to an acceptable level and the EIS should not be approved on this basis. The EIS states 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.

4. No truck movements should be permitted on Darley Rd or any local roads in Leichhardt or adjoining suburbs. 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 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. I object to the selection of the Darley Rd site altogether, but propose this alternative, which appears to represent the least worst impact, should be chosen if this site is to be used.

5. I object to the number of truck movements proposed at the Darley Road site. The EIS states that there will be 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, as is currently provided.

6. 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 and provide a plan for enforcement (to be paid for my SMC and not by the Inner West Council).

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

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

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

Name: Jacqui Goodwin

Signature: Goodwin

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

***Declaration** : I*

Address: 43 Reserve St

Suburb: Annandale Postcode 2038

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 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 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.

- 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 _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Radhanepon Hirsch
	Address: 10 Excelsior Parade
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Marrickville Postcode 2204
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

1. The community has never been consulted or asked about the decision to build a three-stage tollway instead of expanding public transport and WestConnex has never been subjected to democratic decision-making and in fact has been opposed by a huge majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages.
2. I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after submission of comments on the concept design closed. Thousands of comments were submitted on the design and how could these have been considered for the EIS in the available. This raises questions about the integrity of the entire EIS process.
3. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity.
4. 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.
5. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters Interchange will have a heavy disruptive impact on the local transport routes, whether by vehicle, bus, or active transport (walking and cycling).
6. 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 though the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.
7. 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.
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. 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 people living in this region neither asked for nor want the whole WestConnex project which will not serve the needs of this population but who will nonetheless have to live and work with the impact of multiple years of construction, heavy vehicle traffic, noise and pollution, and local disruption and probable damage to their houses or business premises with compensation only a dim prospect.

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

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Rachanepon Hirsch
	Address: 10 Excelsior Parade
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Marrickville Postcode 2204
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

1. Deciding to build a tollway of the scale and complexity proposed and that has never been built before is placing the community at great risk. No project of this kind should be approved on the basis of an 'indicative design'. This risks billions of public monies and resources.
2. The planning process that involves such risks has not been subject to any democratic consideration. The huge majority of community, stakeholder and Council submissions objected to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages. WestCOnnex is now attempting to rush through approval on an even less complete EIS.
3. The business case for the project across the 3 stages failed to measure or account for the cost of any external impacts of this massive toll road project. The social costs of dislocation, stress, health impacts, sleep deprivation and damaged quality of life in communities have been ignored. This proposal will further extend these impacts in Haberfield and St Peters for years. Fresh unacceptable impacts will be imposed on the suburbs of Leichhardt, Lilyfield and Rozelle, parts of which will be decimated. The impact of air pollution on human and environmental health; adding fossil fuel emissions contributing to global warming effects; and the displacement of people and businesses and the destruction of community cohesion and amenity have never been seriously considered. These external costs outweigh any benefits from building roads that poorly serve people's transport needs, induce traffic and displace congestions spots.
4. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 nor 3 provides such access. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1000s more per day onto the roads to Sydney Airport which are already at capacity.
5. This EIS has been released only 14 days after submission of comments on the concept design closed and a report released after the EIS. It seems impossible that the community comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to be incorporated into the EIS in this time. This raises serious questions about the integrity of the entire EIS process.
6. I strongly object to proceeding in the face of unknown hazards associated with two different tunnelling operations taking place in close time and location - the tunnelling for the M4-M5 link and the proposed Sydney Metro tunnelling in the same area - Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters and Newtown. The impact of this combined tunnelling is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the residences and buildings above, many of them very old and heritage listed. This is a serious community safety issue and residents who do experience damage will be caught between 2 separate contractors for repairs and compensation. No approval should be given until a construction plan is produced. It is not sufficient to list heritage buildings. Risks should be evaluated not simply described.
7. Given the high cost of the tolls and their annual increases, it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware Rd and Enmore Rd and though the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria. The increasing numbers of vehicles will mean more roadside pollution in the area (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic).
8. I strongly object to unfiltered stacks. I believe that scientific reports that are being used be the government to justify these is based on out of date evidence. I am appalled that the government would consider building these so close to schools including St Peters and Rozelle Public Schools.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Radhanepon Hirsch
	Address: 10 Excelsior Parade
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Marrickville Postcode 2204
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

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

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

1. The business case for the project across the 3 stages failed to measure or account for the cost of any external impacts of this massive toll road project. This includes the impact of air pollution on human and environmental health; adding fossil fuel emissions thus contributing to 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.
2. Deciding to build a three-stage tollway of the scale and complexity proposed and that has never been built before is placing the community at great risk and at the same time risking billions of public monies and resources. I strongly object to that fact that this risk has never been subjected to democratic decision-making despite being opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages.
3. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity.
4. This EIS has been released only 14 days after submission of comments on the concept design closed and a report released after the EIS. It seems impossible that the community comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to be incorporated into the EIS in this time. This raises serious questions about the integrity of the entire EIS process.
5. I have strong objections to proceeding in the face of the unknown hazard associated with two different tunnelling operations taking place in close time and location - the tunnelling for the M4-M5 link and the proposed Sydney Metro tunnelling in the same area - Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond. The impact of this combined tunnelling is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the residences and buildings above, many of them very old and heritage listed. This is a serious community safety issue and residents who do experience damage will be caught between 2 separate contractors for repairs and compensation. No approval should be given
6. Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware Rd and Enmore Rd and though the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria. The increasing numbers of vehicles will mean more vehicle pollution in the area (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic).
7. The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the St Peters Interchange will increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds sends 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 impact is both dangerous and unacceptable.

The people living near St Peters Interchange neither asked for nor want the whole WestConnex project which will not contribute to the provision of long-term sustainable transport to meet the community needs. At the same time, we will have to live and work with the impact of multiple years of construction, heavy vehicle traffic, noise and pollution, and local disruption possible damage to homes and business premises. I call on the Minister for Planning to reject this project and demand that the government re-think the transport planning for the whole metropolitan area.

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: VICTORIA PYE Signature:
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	*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.*
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: 308/1-13 Garners Ave Suburb: Marrickville Postcode 2204

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

- SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware and Enmore Roads and through the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.
- The EIS at 12-57 describes potentially serious problems where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs. Why is SMC proposing tunnelling within metres of these critical services when no accurate surveying has been done? And when there is only limited information available about the strength of these water tunnels ? The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects ?
- There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.
- I object to the 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.

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

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____