

From: Jackie Davis <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:16 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the basis that it will add to rather than decrease Australia's contribution to climate change, which is obscene! It is completely irresponsible to Australia and the world, and with all we now know (and are experiencing) re climate change, this is absolutely inexcusable.

In addition:

- The project is being conducted within a context of secrecy and lack of accountability
- Traffic exiting from The St Peters interchange will devastate One of Sydney's most unique and thriving suburbs, Newtown

There should be an independent review of WestConnex based on the fact that The project's EIS has not adequately addressed the impacts set out below.

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

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model's margin for error is not stated.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with.

During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more.

SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless.

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

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

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored.

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

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

Yours sincerely, Jackie Davis 83 Station St

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

Please reply to Jackie Davis at jackie.mn@me.com.

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

From: Julie Catanzariti <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:14 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

Smoke stacks near our schools is not acceptable What's is going to happen to the traffic on Edgeware road Please appreciate how unique king street is and do not allow extending the clearway in addition ..

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Julie Catanzariti 25 St Peters St, St Peters NSW 2044, Australia

This email was sent by Julie Catanzariti via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Julie provided an email address (juliethomas100@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Julie Catanzariti at juliethomas100@gmail.com.

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

From: Luke Mico <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 4:35 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Luke Mico King St, Newtown NSW 2042, Australia

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

Please reply to Luke Mico at lukemico@icloud.com.

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

From: Sarah Mares <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:14 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal for multiple reasons (see below) and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds of

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

SUSTAINABILITY – if Sydney is to be a safe and live-able city there has to be investment in effective public transport, not hugely expensive and poorly planned road ways and polluting motor vehicles.

POLLUTION – public transport not cars -in particular 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. Residents close to proposed stacks and exit portals will suffer greatly from direct exposure to poisonous diesel particulates. This is negligent when you consider that the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic.

PLANNING AND DESIGN -in particular inadequate inclusion of and investment in public transport options. **COST**-there must be more intelligent design and more thoughtful ways to spend these billions of \$ than carving up the city . destroying communities, polluting the environment and adding to congestion.

TRAFFIC PREDICTIONS The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved. The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead. We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017) Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits. There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique. The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3

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

LACK OF TRANSPARENCY AND /OR COMPETENCE – the plan and the cost keeps changing. How do we, or anyone know what is actually proposed and what it is likely to cost or how it will impact on us and our community. This appears either profoundly disorganised (a concern given the high cost and stakes of the project) and/or intended to confuse and mislead) When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

LOCAL IMPACTS-I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed. The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets. I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY -I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site. I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning. There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

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

CONSULTATION I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'. SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out above which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

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

Yours sincerely, Sarah Mares View St, Annandale NSW 2038, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Sarah Mares via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Sarah provided an email address (sarahmares9@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sarah Mares at sarahmares9@gmail.com.

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

From: Jenny Kerr <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 4:23 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below which identify Contamination as a serious problem.

Contamination It is clear that the EIS does not meet Secretary's Requirements in relation to contamination.

The Secretary's Requirements for the EIS (SEARS) state that:

'The Proponent must assess whether the land is likely to be contaminated and identify if remediation of the land is required, having regard to the ecological and human health risks posed by the contamination in the context of past, existing and likely (or potential) future land uses. Where assessment and/or remediation is required, the Proponent must document how the assessment and/or remediation would be undertaken in accordance with current guidelines. Table 16-23.'

Although the EIS does identify a number of significant contamination risks when I reviewed of Chapter 16 and technical reports it showed that there are many medium and high risks to human health and the environment that flow from this proposal.

It concerns me that apart from bland statements about future plans, the EIS lacks detailed statements about how these will be handled. For this reason the EIS does not meet the SEARS requirements.

The SEARS further state: '7. The Proponent must assess the impact of any disturbance of contaminated groundwater and the tunnels should be carefully designed so as to not exacerbate mobilisation of contaminated groundwater and/or prevent contaminated groundwater flow.'

There is no evidence that the tunnels have been carefully designed to avoid groundwater contamination. For instance, SMC staff have openly stated at public EIS sessions that no detailed engineering design work has occurred on the Rozelle interchange of any kind. There is only a design concept without any detailed design.

In these circumstances, it is not possible for NSW Planning to assess whether a more detailed future design would exacerbate mobilisation of contaminated groundwater and/or prevent contaminated ground water flow.

I am worried that if such a proposal is approved with identified risks that has so little project detail or mitigation information will jeopardise the health of Sydney residents and add to ecological risks, particularly in Rozelle Bay. We cannot afford to take such a cavalier attitude to the environment or deviate from the Secretary's requirements.

Particular Rozelle and Annandale Risks

The proposed Rozelle civil and tunnel site (C5) at Rozelle and the Crescent Site at Annandale both have severe contamination issues which are rated as High Risk.

Soils at the proposed Rozelle civil and tunnel site have been found to include lead, arsenic, cadmium and zinc exceeding the criteria for open space and commercial/industrial. It is acknowledged in the technical report to the EIS that such contamination could impact on the community. This could occur during the removal of vegetation, ballast stockpile and excavated soil. It could also occur as a result of dewatering and potential contamination of groundwater.

There is also a risk from overland flow and storm water runoff, that could affect the water quality of Easton Park drain, Whites Creek and Rozelle Bay. This endangers the ecological health of the area through potential contamination via overland flow and stormwater runoff which would affect the water quality of the Easton Park drain, Whites Creek and ultimately Rozelle Bay.

Furthermore acid sulphate soils have been identified which could impact on local soil and water quality. Contamination of groundwater is known to be present, widespread and likely to be exposed. (See Table 16-6) The risk is assessed as 'High'.

As a local resident I am extremely concerned that approval of this plan on the basis of a very vague and uncertain concept plan and to leave the supply of detailed information to a post -approval stage would be highly irresponsible and negligent. It would also cause huge anxiety and alarm in the community if such a proposal were to go ahead.

This project must be rejected.

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

Please reply to Jenny Kerr at cecilyst@optusnet.com.au.

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

From: Jean Maxwell <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 4:35 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

I 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.

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

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

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

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

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

I 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Jean Maxwell 4B Leichhardt St, Glebe NSW 2037, Australia

This email was sent by Jean Maxwell via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Jean provided an email address (jeanmaxwell13@hotmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jean Maxwell at jeanmaxwell13@hotmail.com.

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

From: Lou Farnsworth <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:11 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Lou Farnsworth 5 Young St, Tempe NSW 2044, Australia

This email was sent by Lou Farnsworth via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Lou provided an email address (loufarnsworth.87@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lou Farnsworth at loufarnsworth.87@gmail.com.

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

From: Karen Elliott <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 4:19 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on

the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

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

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

Yours sincerely, Karen Elliott 216 View St, Annandale NSW 2038, Australia

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

Please reply to Karen Elliott at kelliott_au@yahoo.com.au.

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

From: Rose Peel <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 4:04 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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.

It seems remarkable that the government can waste money on WestConnex and not have enough for filtration.

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

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

This is negligent when you consider that the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic. It took years for lead to be considered dangerous for children so why would this government risk their brain development.

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

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

Anzac Bridge is already under stress at peak times with cars in first gear. How it will cope with an increase in traffic as projected is just a joke.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Rose Peel 4 Sunnyside Ave, Lilyfield NSW 2040, Australia

This email was sent by Rose Peel via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Rose provided an email address (rosepeel17@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rose Peel at rosepeel17@gmail.com.

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

From: Tamara Sims <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 4:08 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

This is an insanity to go ahead with this proposal. It will not fix the issues you are seeking to address and will in fact create further issues. I strongly object.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Tamara Sims 21 Lyne Ln, Alexandria NSW 2015, Australia

This email was sent by Tamara Sims via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Tamara provided an email address (tamarasims2@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tamara Sims at tamarasims2@gmail.com.

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

From: Rosemary Shakallis <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:04 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly urge that you listen to the objections of the people and take them into account before you proceed with this unwieldy plan to decimate the character of Sydney that we love.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Rosemary Shakallis 128 Evans St, Rozelle NSW 2039, Australia

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

Please reply to Rosemary Shakallis at rowzeemac@hotmail.com.

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

From: Rosemary Shakallis <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 14 October 2017 4:20 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Rosemary Shakallis 128 Evans St, Rozelle NSW 2039, Australia

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

Please reply to Rosemary Shakallis at rowzeemac@hotmail.com.

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

From: Toby Shingleton <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 7:35 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

RE: SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Toby Shingleton 16 Cavey St, Marrickville NSW 2204, Australia

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

Please reply to Toby Shingleton at tobyshingleton@gmail.com.

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

From: Raewyn Robinson <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 7:31 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I wonder at the whole premise behind Westconnex and dragging more congestion into the city when countries in Europe particularly are enlightened enough to keep traffic out!!!!

Yours sincerely, Raewyn Robinson 11/140 Percival Rd, Stanmore NSW 2048, Australia

This email was sent by Raewyn Robinson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Raewyn provided an email address (resolutions2@bigpond.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Raewyn Robinson at resolutions2@bigpond.com.

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

From: D Kessikidis <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 7:30 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moving unfiltered stacks to alternative areas is NOT ok. Saving Paul to kill Peter is all you do when moving unfiltered stacks.

All stacks to be filtered or project halted.

Yours sincerely, D Kessikidis Cecily St, Lilyfield NSW 2040, Australia

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

Please reply to D Kessikidis at dkessikiids@gmail.com.

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

From: Sally Ash <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 7:12 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions .

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. The Premier, in 2008 advocated for filtered stacks for the Lane Cove Tunnel as quoted in the North Shore Times on 23 August 2017:

<http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/newslocal/north-shore/gladys-berejiklian-accused-of-backflipping-on-smokestacks-after-comments-from-2008-revealed/news-story/4aeaa6e5e079fe1735d9401612c3625>

"Members of Parliament should examine their conscience and consider how they would feel if their children or the children of loved ones were exposed to this level of fumes every day and they were part of a government that could have put in place measures to reduce the impact of the fumes," Ms Berejiklian said in 2008, according to transcripts. "It is not too late, the government can still ensure that filtration is a possibility. World's best practice is to filter tunnels. "Why won't they (Labor) allow people to sleep at night, knowing their children aren't inhaling toxins that could jeopardise their health now or in the future?"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Sally Ash 77 Formosa St, Drummoyne NSW 2047, Australia

✓

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

Please reply to Sally Ash at sallyash@bigpond.com.

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

From: Nathan Henderson <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:47 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Nathan Henderson 5/364 Livingstone Rd, Marrickville NSW 2204, Australia

This email was sent by Nathan Henderson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Nathan provided an email address (nhenderson32@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Nathan Henderson at nhenderson32@gmail.com.

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

From: David Alexander <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 5:36 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. This is easily monitored pre and post stack and will result in a class action.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, David Alexander

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

Please reply to David Alexander at david@ioco.com.au.

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

From: Owen Matthews <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:47 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Owen Matthews 4 Jane St, Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

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

Please reply to Owen Matthews at owenmatthews@gmail.com.

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

From: Olivia Patterson <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 5:36 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. This includes one only a couple of hundred metres away from the Infant's Home in Ashfield, which accommodates 5 childcare centres. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. There is a toll on these roads and there is no excuse for not paying for adequate pollution control.

The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Olivia Patterson 14 Milton St N, Ashfield NSW 2131, Australia

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

Please reply to Olivia Patterson at olivia_patterson@hotmail.com.

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

From: David Surridge <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 5:32 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

Please take notice of the people who live and work, and visit this city – we do not want to live in an environment poisoned by fumes or that feels like a car park or freeway, we want to keep our city liveable for this and future generations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And remember we are all your constituents.

Yours sincerely, David Surridge 62 Redmond St, Leichhardt NSW 2040, Australia

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

Please reply to David Surridge at scurge@ihug.com.au.

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

From: Olga Tamara <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:45 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Olga Tamara 73 Justin St, Lilyfield NSW 2040, Australia

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

Please reply to Olga Tamara at olgatamara@me.com.

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

From: Peter Colquhoun <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 5:35 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

When the traffic gets to Alison Rd and Anzac Parade the congestion will be impossible. As I live in Martin Rd this is an intersection I can't avoid.

My son and his 3 children live and go to school near two of the exhaust stacks and I'm concerned about their health and wellbeing.

Yours sincerely, Peter Colquhoun 56 Martin Rd, Centennial Park NSW 2021, Australia

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

Please reply to Peter Colquhoun at peter@colquhoun.com.au.

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

From: Katrina Frankcombe <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:44 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

Unfiltered ventilation stacks should not be built in residential areas, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. Clinical health studies relating to this type of environmental impact requires a long term epidemiology study to identify (or prove absence of) health issues. Given the community concerns raised, the legal ramifications on state government if future studies demonstrate significant health impact on children who attended Rozelle public school will be substantial.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You only need to look at other tollways within cities to understand that they do not take cars off other roads. People will not pay to travel on a road unless it saves them a significant amount of time (which will only happen if the non-toll roads are congested). Eg cross city tunnel. Public transport is the only solution to increasing transport pressures (as per other major cities where trains are the primary form of transport).

The M4 M5 link is touted as being a "city bypass" yet it goes to the city. It should go directly from the M4 to M5 without extending to Rozelle. More cars on the Anzac bridge or Iron Cove bridge is ridiculous. Drummoyne is already extremely congested 7 days/week. Adding more traffic with no long term solution will be deleterious.

I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Katrina Frankcombe 42 Denison St, Rozelle NSW 2039, Australia

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

Please reply to Katrina Frankcombe at katrina_frankcombe@hotmail.com.

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

From: Bettina Pearson <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 5:31 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts of this proposal.

Of particular concern to me are the environmental issues to areas surrounding where I live. The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to the health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me.

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

Yours sincerely, Bettina Pearson 2048

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

Please reply to Bettina Pearson at bettinap@optusnet.com.au.

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

From: Adele Murdoch <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:41 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already

preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Adele Murdoch 26 Northumberland Ave, Stanmore NSW 2048, Australia.

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

Please reply to Adele Murdoch at a.c.murdoch@hotmail.com.

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

From: Zoe Hutchings <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 5:30 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already

preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Zoe Hutchings

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

Please reply to Zoe Hutchings at zoe.hutchings@sandoz.com.

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

From: Jilly Guice <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:26 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I believe in community not developers.

Yours sincerely, Jilly Guice 5A Foord Ave, Hurlstone Park NSW 2193, Australia

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

Please reply to Jilly Guice at jillygwhizz@yahoo.com.au.

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

From: Glen Le Clerc <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 5:26 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Glen Le Clerc 30A Phillips St, Alexandria NSW 2015, Australia

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

Please reply to Glen Le Clerc at glen.leclerc@gmail.com.

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

From: Jonathan Neech <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 5:11 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Jonathan Neech 9 Slade St, Rozelle NSW 2039, Australia

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

Please reply to Jonathan Neech at jonnyneech@gmail.com.

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

From: Jacqueline Middleton <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:41 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

I 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. I also reject the notion that filtration is too expensive or inconvenient to bother with. The pollutants that will spew from these stacks will be similar in toxicity to cigarettes, which are filtered! Don't ALL our children deserve better than this?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Jacqueline Middleton 247 Addison Rd, Marrickville NSW 2204, Australia

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

Please reply to Jacqueline Middleton at jakim@wayback.net.ai.

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

From: Claire Murphy <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 9:26 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I am a mother to 2 young children and I have serious concerns about their future. Please consider our concerns.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Claire Murphey William St, Leichhardt NSW 2040, Australia

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

Please reply to Claire Murphy at clairejmartin@yahoo.com.

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

From: Jennie Minifie <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 5:31 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS. I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below.

1. From a strategic planning viewpoint, the NSW government assumption that construction of motorways will meet the transport demands of the Sydney Region in the future is fatally flawed. There is an enormous disconnect between the government's policy of increasing the total population by another 3 million people; achieved by the Minister for Planning approving ad-hoc, hi-rise residential towers and 'priority precincts' such as Macquarie Park, North Ryde, and Wentworth Point, and it's outmoded American-style motorway expansion plan, which is incapable of meeting the transport needs of the residents and businesses of the people of Sydney and NSW now or in the future.
2. As a resident living in the catchment of the Lane Cove Tunnel, I am experiencing increased levels of air pollution and therefore I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in the Sydney Region, much less that three or four can be located in a single area.
3. It is a fact that diesel particulates are carcinogenic.
4. The Lane Cove Tunnel is used by heavy vehicles from the construction industry especially during the morning peak hours, resulting in increased air pollution. The pollution is visible to drivers entering the tunnel portal at North Ryde. As a result, the LCT operators now tell all drivers to recycle the air in their vehicles as they enter the tunnel!
5. The purpose of an EIS is to identify the issues associated with the application, and to recommend measures that will overcome the adverse impacts or, if the impacts cannot be mitigated, then refusal should be recommended. Why do it otherwise?
6. The Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any underground interchange project similar to the proposed Rozelle Interchange anywhere in the world or find a construction company willing to build it. This proposal should be rejected because it would be madness to approve such a design concept without the knowledge that it could be constructed and also the cost of trying to do so.
7. The proposal will greatly increase traffic congestion in dense urban areas that already experience heavy congestion during the peak hours. There are existing development concept approvals adjacent to the Rozelle Bay foreshore which will result in further increases in traffic volumes well above the current levels. How can vehicular access to each of these development sites and their occupants be provided without causing major disruptions to the traffic flows onto the Anzac Bridge and the link road?
8. Older, historic inner suburbs and in low-lying foreshore areas have community values that have been completely ignored in this proposal. The application should be refused to prevent adverse social, economic and environmental impacts.

Yours sincerely, Jennie Minifie 46 Jeanette St, East Ryde NSW 2113, Australia

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

Please reply to Jennie Minifie at jennie.minifie@gmail.com.

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

From: Patricia Austin <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 4:55 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

This project has been flawed from the start and should be completely replanned. The impact on our community and our future as described below is deeply concerning. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

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

There are many health concerns regarding pollution. It is extraordinary that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area.

I am an older person who enjoys walking and exercising outside. I do not wish to be forced to be moved from my home or to have to stay inside during the day due to pollution from particulate matter. The health of children and the elderly is particularly at risk and any individual, child or adult with asthma or lung vulnerability is likely to have their health compromised from direct exposure to diesel particulates.

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

With four unfiltered emissions stacks in Rozelle, two in Haberfield (one each for the M4East and New M5) and two in St Peters, along with a large number of exit portals, residents of these area will suffer greatly. This is negligent when you consider that the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored.

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

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

Yours sincerely, Patricia Austin 20 Phillips St, Alexandria NSW 2015, Australia

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

Please reply to Patricia Austin at pnaustin@optusnet.com.au.

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

From: Elizabeth English-Gruettke <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 6:32 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Elizabeth English-Gruettke 28 Clark Rd, North Sydney NSW 2060, Australia

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

Please reply to Elizabeth English-Gruettke at elizenglish@outliok.com.

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

From: Thomas Manson <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 10:04 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

Without the detailed design, and only a concept design to work from, there is no certainty or ability for people impacted to influence the final design.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Thomas Manson 43 Tatiara Cres, North Narrabeen NSW 2101, Australia

This email was sent by Thomas Manson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Thomas provided an email address (thomas.manson@outlook.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Thomas Manson at thomas.manson@outlook.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

From: Helen Whyatt <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 6:21 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions. And actually take the community's concerns into account for once!

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks. This smacks of hypocrisy if not done.

With four unfiltered emissions stacks in Rozelle, two in Haberfield (one each for the M4East and New M5) and two in St Peters, along with a large number of exit portals, residents of these area will suffer greatly from direct exposure to poisonous diesel particulates.

This is negligent when you consider that the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

And, frankly, no country in the developed world is building more roads in their cities, they are building more means of public transport and trying to get cars off the road. Increased bus frequency would be a start ...

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets. It is utterly ridiculous to push more traffic into the area – the main objective should be to take cars off the roads, not create more traffic chaos.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model's margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA

granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Helen Wyatt 51/74 Princes Hwy, St Peters NSW 2044, Australia

This email was sent by Helen Wyatt via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Helen provided an email address (hels_belles03@yahoo.co.uk) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Helen Wyatt at hels_belles03@yahoo.co.uk.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

From: Jemma Campbell <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 6:26 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions .

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

With four unfiltered emissions stacks in Rozelle, two in Haberfield (one each for the M4East and New M5) and two in St Peters, along with a large number of exit portals, residents of these area will suffer greatly from direct exposure to poisonous diesel particulates.

This is negligent when you consider that the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Jemma Campbell 1/55 College St, Drummoyne NSW 2047, Australia

This email was sent by Jemma Campbell via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Jemma provided an email address (jemmaferguson@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jemma Campbell at jemmaferguson@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

From: Paula Callen <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 10:05 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I very strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions .

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

With four unfiltered emissions stacks in Rozelle, two in Haberfield (one each for the M4East and New M5) and two in St Peters, along with a large number of exit portals, residents of these area will suffer greatly from direct exposure to poisonous diesel particulates.

This is extremely negligent when you consider that the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Paula Callen 185 Bexley Rd, Kingsgrove NSW 2208, Australia

This email was sent by Paula Callen via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Paula provided an email address (pippity33@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Paula Callen at pippity33@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

From: Louise Lourey <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 6:07 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

Please put community needs first in planning and seriously consider community concerns. I object to current Westconnex plans and the impact this will have on our inner west communities. Destroying homes and polluting communities is not the way forward for a more sustainable future. Westconnex is not the best world planning standards nor what a future Sydney needs.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

With four unfiltered emissions stacks in Rozelle, two in Haberfield (one each for the M4East and New M5) and two in St Peters, along with a large number of exit portals, residents of these area will suffer greatly from direct exposure to poisonous diesel particulates.

This is negligent when you consider that the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a drive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model's margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA

granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Louise Lourey 19 Tennyson St, Dulwich Hill NSW 2203, Australia

This email was sent by Louise Lourey via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Louise provided an email address (loulourey@optusnet.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Louise Lourey at loulourey@optusnet.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

From: Helen Bushell <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 10:00 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

I 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.

With four unfiltered emissions stacks in Rozelle, two in Haberfield (one each for the M4East and New M5) and two in St Peters, along with a large number of exit portals, residents of these areas will be exposed to poisonous fumes.

Many of the areas along the WestConnex corridor are already congested at peak times. The EIS recognises that this will have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic.

I am also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

I object to the acquisition of the Darley Road 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. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Helen Bushell 63 Darley St, Newtown NSW 2042, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Helen Bushell via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the

FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Helen provided an email address (kagibush@dodo.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Helen Bushell at kagibush@dodo.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: BLAIR VIDAKOVICH	
	Address: 6 ARTHUR ST	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LEICHMARDT	Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: BVL	
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 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.
- 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.
- 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 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.
- 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).
- 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 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 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. 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

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name:	
	Address:	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb:	Postcode
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:	
Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

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)

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 Hall

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: Marrickville

Suburb:

Postcode

2204

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

- ❖ Removal of vegetation – Leichhardt. The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the Darley Road site. There are several mature trees located on the north of the site. None of these trees should be removed as they provide precious greenery. They also act as a visual and noise screen for residents from the City West Link traffic. All efforts should be taken to retain the trees and the EIS should not simply permit these trees to be removed without proper investigations being undertaken as to how they can be retained. If they are removed following a proper investigation and consideration of all options, then the approval needs to specify that all streets are replaced with mature, native trees at the conclusion of the construction at the site
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ The modelling area shown in Figure 8-5 should be extended to include Johnston Street and The Crescent/Minogue Crescent/Ross Street corridor to Parramatta Road to provide clarity on how these feeder routes are envisaged to operate in 2023 and 2033. It should include the modelling assumptions applied
- ❖ The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' Therefore this entire process is a sham as the extent to which concerns are taken into account is not known as the contractor can simply make further changes. As the contractor is not bound to take into account community impacts outside of the strict requirements and as the contractor will be trying to deliver the project as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is likely that the additional measure proposed with respect to construction noise mitigation for (example) will not be adopted. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS is riddled with caveats and lacks clear obligations and requirements for project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

To: Planning Services, Department of Planning
and Environment. GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW,
2001

Attention: Director - Transport Assessments

Application No: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: *Tiffany Whitham*

Signature: *[Handwritten 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: *41 Emma St*

Suburb: *Leichhardt* Postcode: *2040*

I am strongly opposed to Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link) for the following reasons -

WESTCONNEX STATED OBJECTIVES

1. The main reason given for the construction of the WestConnex motorway is to connect to Sydney Airport and Port Botany. The project has failed to meet both of these objectives.

QUESTIONABLE TRAVEL

2. If stage 3 of the Westconnex project is completed, it is predicted that by 2033, reductions in peak travel times from Western Sydney to the airport and to the Botany Port area will be **miniscule**. Parramatta to Sydney airport will save **10 minutes**, between Burwood and Sydney Airport the time saved will be **5 minutes** and between Silverwater and Port Botany the time saved will be **10 minutes**. These are only the best predictions put forward and time savings may in fact be much less. The whole rationale for building this wasteful **18 billion dollar** polluting project was precisely for that reason... to reduce travel times and to connect with Port Botany and the Airport.

SUBSIDENCE AND HOUSE DAMAGE

3. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur", further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of **ground movement and subsidence is lessened** where tunnelling is more than **35m underground**. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are extremely shallow eg **John St at 22m, Hill St at 28m, Moore St 27m (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28m (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**.

UNFILTERED STACKS - HEALTH DANGERS

4. It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With massive number of extra truck **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."

PARKING CONGESTION

5. 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.

POLLUTION - AIR/NOISE

6. The Rozelle Interchange, including the Inner West Interchange, and surrounding streets will experience **increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution** - ie at The Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St in

Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and in 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. Also, the widening of the Crescent between the city West Link and Johnston street with **an extra lane being constructed** will lead to heavy traffic congestion on a road that has **3 Primary/Infants schools**. Furthermore, the EIS states that the current Rozelle Interchange and surrounds of Anzac Bridge are presently close to full capacity. In fact, Anzac Bridge is **currently at maximum** capacity during peak hours. With the proposed construction, the area is going to be subjected to a huge increase in vehicle movements throughout the 5 year construction period.

REMOVAL OF SPOIL - TRUCK MOVEMENTS

7. The removal of spoil from the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to **the largest number of spoil truck movements** on the entire Stage 3 project: **517 Heavy truck movements a day**, of which 46 are stated to take place during peak hours. This will lead to extra noise and air pollution in this area.

The **unacceptable noise levels** which will accompany the construction of this massive interchange will further add to the discomfort of the residents. No analysis has been provided of the magnitude of increased noise pollution which will adversely affect residents. The EIS actually states that local residents may have to keep their windows and doors closed to keep out the noise and dust. The proposed work hours for construction in the Goods Yard for the tunneling and spoil removal are 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This could lead to loss of sleep for local residents as well as loss of lifestyle.

There will also be disturbance of soil in the old Rozelle Goods Yard which may be thick with toxic 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.

LOSS OF PARKS AND RECREATIONAL SPACE

8. 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 innercity area. Further, Buruwan Park lies on a **major cycle route** from Railway Parade through to Anzac Bridge, IJTS and the CBD.

PROPOSED 'PARK' in ROZELLE GOODS YARD

9. The proposed building of a park in the area of the Goods Yard right in the middle of a large number of exit portals and **poisonous smoke stacks** borders on being criminally negligent. This new 'recreational area' will be subject to the dangerous invisible particulates of 2.5 microns and smaller so many residents and children will be unaware that they are being poisoned. **All evidence shows that these particulates are linked with increased cases of asthma, lung disease, cancer and stroke** placing further pressure on our already overloaded health system.

CONSULTATION

10. Although the EIS indicates what is to be expected when construction begins, it also states that that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed upon. This may result in major **changes to the project design and construction methodologies**. **The community would have no say in this process!**

SUBJECT TO CHANGE

11. In the introduction of the EIS it clearly states that the information in the EIS is "indicative of the final design" only. The reality of this statement means that the project may be completely different to stated plans in the EIS with residents given no say in the final outcome.

For the reasons listed above the project should not go ahead and alternatives looked into that seriously takes into consideration all of the issues raised above such as has been proposed by the City of Sydney Council.

Brian Nicholls

briannic@bigpond.com

82 Church St

Birchgrove NSW 2041 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Brian Nicholls

Shawn Burns

shawnburns1805@yahoo.com.au

8A The Ter

Birchgrove NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

Stop the polluting towers infecting our children!!!

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Shawn Burns

Gwynedd Duncan-Jones

gduncan_jones@hotmail.com

97 Short St

Birchgrove NSW 2041 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Gwynedd Duncan-Jones

Mary Spink

mary.spink@gmail.com

Allen St

Leichardt NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Spink

Diane Davies

dianedavies2@yahoo.com.au

Burrawog Pde

Urunga NSW 2455 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Diane Davies

Justine Mercer Moore

gusmercermore@hotmail.com

Elswick St

Leichhardt NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Justine Mercer Moore

Andrea Dell

aernda_lled@hotmail.com

Euston Rd

Alexandria NSW 2015 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

The impact on Sydney park and proximity of the ever-widening Euston rd to residential houses is unacceptable due to noise and air pollution from cars.

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Andrea Dell

Ashleigh Chance

Ashleigh_Chance@hotmail.com

Evans St

Rozelle NSW 2039 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Ashleigh Chance

Sean Corrigan

quoll_fnq@optusnet.com.au

Lae St

Trinity Beach QLD 4879 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submission's closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Sean Corrigan

Adrian Twigg

adriantwigg@gmail.com

Leichhardt St

Leichhardt NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution-and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Adrian Twigg

David Steele

david.steele1000@gmail.com

Liverpool Rd

Enfield NSW 2136 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

David Steele

Inga McLeod

ijvision@hotmail.com

Lookes Ave

Balmain East NSW 2041 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Inga McLeod

Michael Stevenson

michael-r-stevenson@hotmail.com

Norman St

Rozelle NSW 2039 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Stevenson

Van Allen

vandila2000@yahoo.com.au

Reynolds St

Balmain NSW 2041 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Van Allen

Susan Kelly

susankelbe@bigpond.com

Richmond St

Gordon Park QLD 4031 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Susan Kelly

Kate Doyle

kate.doyle@sydney.edu.au

Riverdale Ave

Marrickville NSW 2204 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Kate Doyle

Pauline Lee

leep7122@gmail.com

Ryan St

Lilyfield NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Pauline Lee

Pauline Lee

leep7122@gmail.com

75 Ryan St

Lilyfield NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS tollroad proposal.

Global experience of major toll roads demonstrates that these projects are enormously expensive and counter-productive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity. It is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. The negative impacts on the health and well-being of local community's both in the construction and operation phases are unacceptable.

The fact that the State Government released this EIS just 2 weeks after submissions closed for comment on the M4-M5 Link Concept Design, undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

The impending sale of over 51% of WestConnex means that the government will transfer the whole of WestConnex and the construction of M4-M5 Link project completely into the hands of a private company which will not give adequate protections to the community.

In particular I object to the M4-M5 Link because:

- 1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.
- 2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.
- 3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.
- 4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.
- 5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.
- 6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.

Extra comments

Unfiltered stacks, chaos at Anzac Bridge & gross tolls. Who would want West Connex except tunnel builders & toll companies? It is about time you asked the tax payers how to spend our money . ?

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Pauline Lee

Janene Porter

janene.porter@gmail.com

Spring St

Balmain NSW 2041 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Janene Porter

Mike Bich

mcbirch48@gmail.com

Tuntable Falls Rd

Nimbin NSW 2480 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Mike Bich

Stuart Hickson

stuarthickson@gmail.com

Dulwich Hill NSW 2203 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Stuart Hickson

Skye Mitchell

smitch925@gmail.com

Ultimo NSW 2007 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Skye Mitchell

Pamela Davis

seat.fairy@gmail.com

NSW 2010 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Pamela Davis

Robyn Fairdax-Ross

robynfairfaxross@gmail.com

Alexandria NSW 2015 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Robyn Fairdax-Ross

Peter Kuestler

peterkuestler@gmail.com

Kingsford NSW 2032 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Kuestler

Linda Avramides

la@linda.net.au

South Coogee NSW 2034 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Linda Avramides

Agostino Marcello

agostinom@gmail.com

NSW 2037 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Agostino Marcello

Andrea Kindryd

andeaus@gmail.com

NSW 2037 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Andrea Kindryd

Barbara Doran

barbara.doran@internode.on.net

NSW 2037 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Barbara Doran

Janet Bate

jardindome@gmail.com

Rozelle NSW 2039 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Janet Bate

Kim Caldwell

kim.caldwell@optusnet.com.au

Lilyfield NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Kim Caldwell

Antonia Mocatta

Antonia.mocatta@gmail.com

Newtown NSW 2042 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Antonia Mocatta

Zio Ledeux

hellozio@hotmail.com

Erskineville NSW 2043 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Zio Ledeux

Matt Potter

mattp3@bigpond.com

NSW 2046 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Matt Potter

Jenny Shanley

designatopia@aol.com

Manly NSW 2095 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Jenny Shanley

Anthony Backhouse

tonybackhouse@gmail.com

NSW 2100 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Anthony Backhouse

Michael Bianchino

mbianchino@optusnet.com.au

Cheltenham NSW 2119 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Bianchino

Judy Schneider

jjeschneid@hotmail.com

Ashfield NSW 2131 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

All exhaust stacks should be filtered. It is reckless and irresponsible to subject people living in the proximity of the stacks, to be exposed to the additional pollutants, which are likely to impact negatively on their health. I can see the class actions being taken out in the future against the State Government and the increased need for more hospitals, etc., should the stacks be left unfiltered.

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Judy Schneider

Katie Stackhouse

kstackhouse@ozemail.com.au

Ashfield NSW 2131 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Katie Stackhouse

From: Kate Stackhouse <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 10:40 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions .

I absolutely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

With four unfiltered emissions stacks in Rozelle, two in Haberfield (one each for the M4East and New M5) and two in St Peters, along with a large number of exit portals, residents of these area will suffer greatly from direct exposure to poisonous diesel particulates.

This is negligent when you consider that the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts

will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car

emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Kate Stackhouse Goodwin Ave, Ashfield NSW 2131, Australia

This email was sent by Kate Stackhouse via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Kate provided an email address (kstackhouse@ozemail.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kate Stackhouse at kstackhouse@ozemail.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

From: Kate Stackhouse <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 10:36 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions .

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built ANYWHERE in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in ALL areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

With four unfiltered emissions stacks in Rozelle, two in Haberfield (one each for the M4East and New M5) and two in St Peters, along with a large number of exit portals, residents of these area will suffer greatly from direct exposure to poisonous diesel particulates.

This is negligent when you consider that the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic.

If the appalling and potentially corrupt project were to be scrapped in favour of more public transport options, you wouldn't need stacks at all, or any of the other associated pollution, increased traffic and ongoing disruption to people's lives.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site. It's unbelievable that such a thing could've happened.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model's margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Kate Stackhouse Goodwin Ave, Ashfield NSW 2131, Australia

This email was sent by Kate Stackhouse via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Kate provided an email address (kstackhoue@ozemail.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kate Stackhouse at kstackhoue@ozemail.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

J Johnson

jewellhjohnson@mac.com

Rouse Hill NSW 2155 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I do postgraduate degree at Uni and use West Connex M2.

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

J Johnson

Fotini Manikakis

fot@ozemail.com.au

Marrickville NSW 2204 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Fotini Manikakis

Tim Lassig

tim@hospitalityfitouts.com.au

NSW 2223 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Tim Lassig

Ruth Boydell

ruth.boydell@gmail.com

Kotara NSW 2289 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Ruth Boydell

Sharyn Lacey

sharynlacey62@gmail.com

NSW Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Sharyn Lacey

Donna Abela

abeladonna@iinet.net.au

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Donna Abela

Claire May

clairemay333@gmail.com

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Claire May

From: James May <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 1:08 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I object to this proposal in its entirety, especially since there is proof that children will be harmed by the use of unfiltered smoke stacks required for this project. Indeed, Westconnex is harmful to the health of our children and all our citizens as it will only increase the pollution in our city. I urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a drive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early

November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model's margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, James May 49 Robertson Rd, Centennial Park NSW 2021, Australia

This email was sent by James May via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however James provided an email address (clairemay333@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to James May at clairemay333@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

Mary Court

marycourt@bigpond.com

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Court

Noelle Janaczewska

noellejan19@gmail.com

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Noelle Janaczewska

Blaz Rakich

rosierakich@gmail.com

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Blaz Rakich

Jeff Irvine

theirv@hotmail.com

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Jeff Irvine

Janet Green

janet@coredirections.com.au

1 Northcote Rd

Glebe NSW 2037 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Janet Green

Virginia Field

vffield@gmail.com.au

10 Waragil St

Blackheath NSW 2785 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

Westconnex and the roadworks through western Sydney is environmental rape! Just shocking!

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Virginia Field

Louis Elias

louis1eli@outlook.com

103 Parramatta Rd

Annandale NSW 2038 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Louis Elias

Janan Clowes

jtclowes@gmail.com

105 Annandale

Annandale NSW 2038 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Janan Clowes

Thomas McSweeney

tommiemcsweeney@hotmail.com

105 Slade Rd

Bardwell Park NSW 2207 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Thomas McSweeney

Katherine Gaul

kathy.j.gaul@gmail.com

12 Henderson St

Goulburn NSW 2580 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

Public transport is what we need, NOT more GRIDLOCK!!!!

I have read the Department's [Privacy Statement](#) and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Katherine Gaul

Marie Dreux

dreuxy@icloud.com

19 Bishop St

Petersham NSW 2049 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Marie Dreux

Rachael Beckett

beckettbrine@optusnet.com.au

19 Fishers Reserve

Petersham NSW 2049 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

Attn: Secretary re WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.

Extra comments

Enough- need to look for solutions beyond roads that bring pollution and destroy communities.

I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

I have not made a reportable donation to a political party.

Yours sincerely,

Rachael Beckett