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

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

2. The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.

3. The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.

4. The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

5. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

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

7. The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns. My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

a) The EIS needs to require that all workers are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads at the Darley Road site. This is justified because the site provides 11 car spacers for an estimated 100 workers a day on site. The project cannot be approved on this basis without a strict requirement on workers to use public transport or project provided transport and a prohibition needs to be in place against parking on local streets. The EIS needs to require that this restriction is included in all contracts and in the relevant approval documentation.

b) Traffic diversions – Leichhardt. The EIS states that ‘temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction’ (8-65). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents. Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.

c) The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

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

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

Name: Jennifer Jenkins

Signature: [Signature]

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

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

Address: 205/150 Bronte Rd, Woollahra, NSW, 2024

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

2. Noise impacts - Pyrmont Bridge Road site - The EIS indicates that residents will be subjected to severe noise impacts for up to 4 months, caused by the long-term construction work proposed for this site which includes 8 weeks to demolish buildings, followed by 6 weeks to establish construction facilities, with pavement and infrastructure works required (EIS, 10-112) The EIS contains limited mitigation proposed to manage such impacts.

3. Volumes on the main links (the trunks) cannot be as high as what is claimed in the EIS. It is physically untenable.

4. I object to this stage of WestConnex which doesn’t benefit western Sydney in any way because it doesn’t even include the links to Port Botany or Sydney Airport which were the main justification for the whole project.

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

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

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

8. SMC have made it extremely difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS. The local Glebe library only has one copy and this is the situation at other local libraries. There are very limited hours of access to these locations outside normal working hours. Access to the EIS is very difficult without access to a personal computer. This totally restricts open community engagement.

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

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

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

2. The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.

3. The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.

4. The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

5. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

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

7. The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

---

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

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

Name: Kim Ihnatko
Signature: [Signature]

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

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

Address: 1712 Carlson St
Suburb: Erskineville
Postcode: 2043

a) I am concerned that while hundreds of impacts on resident, including noise, loss of business, dust, and lost time through more traffic congestion, are identified in the EIS, the approach is always to recommend approval and promise vague 'mitigation' in the future. This is not good enough.

b) The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

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

d) The site should be returned to the community as compensation for the imposition of this construction site in our neighbourhood for a 5 year period. If the substation and water treatment plant is moved to the north of the site, then the lower half of the site (which is the most accessible end) could be converted into open space with mature trees planted. As this site is immediately adjacent to the bay run, bicycle parking and other facilities that support active transport could be included. This would result increase the green space for residents and result in a pleasant green environment for pedestrians, rather than a fenced facility.

e) The City West Link Eastbound AM and PM peak hour and other locations. "Table 7-19 shows that several locations are forecast to exceed theoretical roadway capacity with the increased background traffic and the construction traffic in the 2021 AM and PM peak hours. However, traffic on the majority of these roads would exceed their theoretical capacity even without the construction traffic, simply due to the growth in background traffic". So in the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, massive amounts of construction traffic are going to be added for the whole construction period of 5 years. Even on completion it is stated in the EIS that traffic will be worse in this area than 'without the project'. This categorically shows that the planning of Westconnex is totally inadequate and needs major changes. It also shows that when completed Westconnex will not work. It is abundantly obvious that Rail/Metro is the only option to radically overhaul Sydney's failed transport systems.
I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS.

Name: Marian Barker

Signature: 

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

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

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

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

a) I am concerned that while hundreds of impacts on resident, including noise, loss of business, dust, and lost time through more traffic congestion, are identified in the EIS, the approach is always to recommend approval and promise vague 'mitigation' in the future. This is not good enough.

b) The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

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

d) The site should be returned to the community as compensation for the imposition of this construction site in our neighbourhood for a 5 year period. If the substation and water treatment plant is moved to the north of the site, then the lower half of the site (which is the most accessible end) could be converted into open space with mature trees planted. As this site is immediately adjacent to the bay run, bicycle parking and other facilities that support active transport could be included. This would result in increased green space for residents and result in a pleasant green environment for pedestrians, rather than a fenced facility.

e) The City West Link Eastbound AM and PM peak hour and other locations. "Table 7-19 shows that several locations are forecast to exceed theoretical roadway capacity with the increased background traffic and the construction traffic in the 2021 AM and PM peak hours. However, traffic on the majority of these roads would exceed their theoretical capacity even without the construction traffic, simply due to the growth in background traffic". So in the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, massive amounts of construction traffic are going to be added for the whole construction period of 5 years. Even on completion it is stated in the EIS that traffic will be worse in this area than 'without the project'. This categorically shows that the planning of Westconnex is totally inadequate and needs major changes. It also shows that when completed Westconnex will not work. It is abundantly obvious that Rail/Metro is the only option to radically overhaul Sydney's failed transport systems.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Michelle Malony
Signature: [signature]

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

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

Address: 61 Victoria St, Leichhardt

Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode: 2040

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

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

⇒ The consultants for the Social and Economic Impact study is HillPDA. This company has a conflict of interest and is not an appropriate choice to do a social impact study of WestCONnex.

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

⇒ Amongst its services it offers property valuation services and promotes property development in what are perceived to be strategic locations. HillPDA were heavily involved in work leading to the development of Urban Growth NSW and the heavily criticised Parramatta Rd Study. It is not in the public interest to use public funds on an EIS done by a company that has such a heavy stake in property development opportunities along the Parramatta Rd corridor. One of the advantages of property development along Parramatta Rd that Hill PDA promotes on its website is the 33 kilometre WestCONnex.
I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS.

1) The assessment of Strategic Alternative 2 (Investment in “alternative transport” modes) should:
   ◦ identify key network capacity issues
   ◦ identify the shift away from private vehicles required to deliver the necessary relief on the road network to meet the future transport needs of Sydney
   ◦ identify the mix of investments in public transport, cycling and walking required to deliver these mode splits.
   ◦ use multi-modal transport modelling and economic assessment to inform the analysis and assessment of the alternative.

2) Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex, yet there are no detailed construction plans. It is not enough to say there will be mitigation if negative impacts unfold. An EIS should assess risks and be able to predict whether they are worth risking and if so, what mitigation should be necessary.

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

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

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

6) The Concept Design was a woefully inadequate document totally devoid of any real depth of detail in terms of maps, scales, distances with only vague suggestions and glamorized Artist’s Impressions of an idealized view of what Stage 3 would be like. It was another example of current city planning documents that consistently accentuate huge areas of tranquil green spaces with families and children out walking and riding bicycles in idealized parks and suburbs. All this is total PR spin and bears no reality about the real outcome of the build. It bears no reality as to what Stage 3 of Westconnex will be like.

7) I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The EIS states that the risk of ground settlement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35m (EIS Vol 2B App E p1). Yet the depths of tunnelling in streets leading to and around the Inner West Interchange are astonishingly low, eg John St at 22m, Emma St at 24m, Hill St at 28m, Moore St 27m, Piper St 37m, (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2), Catherine St at 28m (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1) - homes would indisputably sustain damage or cracking at these depths.

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

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

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

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

- The modelling conclusions are internally inconsistent. There is an assumption that traffic would dissipate at the edge of the motorway with no negative impacts on the CBD, Mascot and Alexandria. However there is also an assumption that additional roads would be needed to cope with said traffic.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

a) This EIS treats the public with contempt. It offers no final design, no commitment to an outcome and only the most vague and unreliable traffic modelling. It seeks to get NSW Government approval so that the opportunity to design, build, operate, maintain and toll the road can be sold to private investors, completely outside of the view of the public who will bear the effects on their community for the next 100 years. This is a continuation of the appalling disregard for transparency and disregard of the population that bears the brunt of the WestConnex traffic impacts. It displays a lack of understanding of contemporary good practice in transport problem resolution.

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

c) The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

d) It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With four unfiltered emissions stacks in the area plus a large number of exit portals, the residents of this area will suffer greatly from poisonous diesel particulates. This is negligent when you consider that, the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic. "As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."
I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

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

2) The assessment states that there will be a net increase in GHG emissions in 2023 under the ‘with project’ scenario, however under the 2023 ‘cumulative’ scenario, there will be a net decrease in emissions (page 22—15). However, as the ‘cumulative’ scenario includes the Sydney Gateway and Western Harbor Tunnel projects, which are not yet confirmed to proceed, the ‘with project’ scenario should be considered as a likely outcome — which would see an increase in emissions. Both scenarios for 2033 show a reduction in emissions vs the ‘do minimum’ scenario. This is likely to rely on ‘free-flow’ conditions for the Project for most of the day. Should this not occur, the modelled outcomes could be significantly different.

3) Increased traffic on Gardeners Road will require land use planning changes that may decrease the value of land.

4) Recent experience tells us that numbers of people in the ongoing construction of Stages 1 and 2 have suffered extensive damage to their homes caused by vibration, tunnelling activities, and changed soil moisture content costing thousands of dollars to rectify, and although they followed all the elected procedures their claims have not been settled. Insurance policies will not cover this type of damage. The onus has been on them to prove that damage to their homes was caused by Westconnex. Furthermore, the EIS actually concedes that there will be moisture drawdown caused by tunnelling. There is nothing addressing these major concerns in the EIS. This is what residents in Annandale, Leichhardt and Lilyfield are facing and it is totally unacceptable.

5) The statements made that public transport cannot serve diverse areas are empirically incorrect. The area the Westconnex is being built in has higher public transport mode use than the Greater Metropolitan Area as noted in the IES.
I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: [Signature]

Signature: [Signature]

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

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

Address: 6 [Redacted] Sydney NSW 2193

Suburb: Ashbury NSW

Postcode: 2193

The EIS states that after the M4-M5 opens, that traffic on Darley Road will increase by 4%. There is no benefit in the overall project for residents. During construction westbound traffic will increase on Darley Road by 37%. This increase in traffic for a period of up to five years will make it hazardous to cross the road and access the light rail and travel to Blackmore oval, the bat run, the dog park and the Leichhardt pool. In addition, it will drastically increase both local traffic and outer area traffic at peak commute times. We therefore object to the location of this site based on the unacceptable traffic impacts it will have on road users and on residents.

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

The EIS was released just 12 days after the closing date for submissions to the Concept Design. This categorically proves that all the Community Consultations and Submissions to the Concept Design were a total sham. There were at least 800 posts on the interactive map. These were limited as the community only had 140 characters available to make their point which was woefully inadequate. But there were at least 1500 written submissions, some of which were highly detailed and of considerable length. There is no way that all these submissions could have been read, considered, their arguments integrated into the EIS and then for the EIS of 7200 pages to be put together, printed and released 12 days after the the closing date for submissions to the Concept Design There needs to be a major investigation into this flagrant abuse of the way NSW planning laws have been flouted for the whole of Westconnex and particularly Stage 3.

Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. There must be a review of the NSW government's unacceptable policy on this issue. I am appalled that the ex Minister for Planning Rob Stokes who approved the New M5 and unfiltered stacks in St Peters and Haberfield would declare that he would not have them in his own area. How can residents have any trust in a process that is underpinned by such hypocrisy.

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

The operational Green House Gas (GHG) assessment is based on the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3). This model has major flaws and the unreliable outputs of the model put into question the GHG assessment.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: [Signature]

Address: 802 Gelding St, Dulwich Hill, NSW 2203

Suburb: Dulwich Hill, NSW 2203
Postcode: 2203

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

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name ___________________ Email ___________________

Already on list
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Submission from:
Name: [REDACTED]
Signature: [REDACTED]

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

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

Address: [REDACTED]
Suburb: [REDACTED]

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

- Vegetation: Leichhardt. The mature trees on the Darley Road site should be preserved. If any trees are removed during construction it should be a condition of approval that they are replaced with mature trees.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name __________________________ Email __________________________ Mobile __________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

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

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

- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

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

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

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

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

- The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

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

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

- The EIS acknowledges that ‘rat running’ by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.

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

- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

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

2. The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.

3. The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.

4. The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

5. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

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

7. The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

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

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

iii. The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

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

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

vi. The EIS acknowledges that 'rat running' by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.

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

viii. Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

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

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

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

- Targets for renewable energy and offsets are unclear

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

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

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

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

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

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

b. I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)

d. Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. This is however a caveat – the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.

e. I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.

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

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

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

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

B. Why are two different options being suggested for Haberfield? It is clear that both of these are unacceptable and will expose residents to unnecessary traffic danger, congestion and disruption with capacity to enjoy their homes and environment. It is unacceptable especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns. My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

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

- The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.

- The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.

- The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

- It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

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

- The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluded from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VIII. I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

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

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

- The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

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

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

- The EIS acknowledges that 'rat running' by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. The only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.

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

- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-MS Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

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

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

3. I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

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

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

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

Name ___________________________________________ Email ____________________________ Mobile __________________________
Attention Director  
Application Number: SSI 7485  

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  

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

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

B. The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.  

C. The EIS states “Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle.” Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.  

D. The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.  

E. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.  

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

G. The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.  

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.

- The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.

- The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

- It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

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

- The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

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

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

3. The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

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

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

6. The EIS acknowledges that ‘rat running’ by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.

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

8. Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals 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, costing, and business case.

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

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

- The EIS states that spoil handling at the Pyrmont Bridge Road Tunnel Site (C9) will "occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week" for about four years. Given the land use surrounding the site is dense residential, what mitigation measures will be used to control noise, light spill, etc. outside normal business hours? Have alternative living arrangements and/or compensation been considered? (P 8–55)

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

Name:
Signature:
Address: 45 Holroyd 3
Suburb: Newtown
Postcode 2042
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres underground. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 27metres. Piper St 37metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 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

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

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres underground. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 27metres. Piper St 37 metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Wendy Thornton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>33 Holmwood St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb:</td>
<td>Newtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode:</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>W Thornton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Name: Dion Barbeau
Signature: 

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

Address: 20 David Rd  
Suburb: Springwood  
Postcode: 2777

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

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

c) There have been widespread reports in the media about extensive unresolved disputes regarding damages to houses in the Stage 1 M4 and Stage 2 M5 construction process. Why should the community believe that there will not be extensive damages to houses in Stage 3?

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

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

f) The justification for this project relies on the completion of other projects such as the Western Harbour Tunnel which has not yet been planned, let alone approved.

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

Name __________________ Email __________________ Mobile __________________

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

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments
Application Number: SSI 7485
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

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

- The traffic modelling process is not fit for purpose and places significant risks on the people of NSW in terms of:
  - Traffic impacts that are significantly different to those presented in the EIS.
  - Toll earnings that are significantly lower than projections - resulting in government subsidising the owner for lost earnings.

- There is no statement on the level of accuracy and reliability of the traffic modelling process. This is a major shortcoming and is contrary to the Secretary's Environmental Assessments Requirements. Westconnex traffic modelling relies on implausible traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the road links and intersections at several key locations.

- The great number of heritage houses in the Rozelle interchange construction zone has not been specifically addressed. Noise and vibration impacts can have far more significant impacts on these types of properties. There is no functional management plan for these risks, no articulated complaints investigation process nor any articulated compensation and remediation strategy.

- This is despite the RMS being the client for the Sydney Motorways Corporation. It would appear this is a deliberate strategy of the NSW Government to ensure local communities affected by construction traffic have no reasonable means of managing any complaint. It is undemocratic, against the principles of open government espoused in the election platform of the current government and ultimately escalates community unrest. (P 8-44)

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

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

- The project objectives (Part 3.3 of EIS) include enabling the construction of motorways over the harbour and to the northern beaches. However, the traffic impacts of these motorways in Rozelle have not been assessed. These projects were not part of the business case that justified the WestConnex in the first place. This constant shifting of reasoning as to why the project is justified points to a desperation to find a reason to build it, rather than there being a clear need to be serviced.

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

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

Name: Annie Goodwin
Signature: 

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

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

Address: 91 Cavendish St, Stanmore 2048

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

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

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

Visual amenity - Pyrmont Bridge Road site - The EIS acknowledges that visual impacts will occur during construction. However it does not propose to address these negative impacts in the design of the project. This is unacceptable and the EIS needs to propose walls, plant and perimeter treatments and other measures at appropriate locations to lessen the impact on visual amenity.

(Executive Summary xviii)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 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.

- The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically mention all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.

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

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

- The Darley Road site should be rejected because it involves acquiring Dan Murphy’s. This business was renovated and opened with full knowledge that it was to be acquired. The lessee and sub-lessees should not be permitted compensation in these circumstances. The demolition of the entire building (which the EIS confirms will occur) is wasteful and represents mismanagement of public resources.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application for SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: I Atekm
Signature: 

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

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

Address: 
Suburb: 
Postcode: 

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

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

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

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

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

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

For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.

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

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

Name: Dianne Briggs

Signature: D Briggs

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

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

Address: 168 Camden St, Enmore, 2042

The three Pollution Stacks in the Rozelle Rail yards are shown to be 38 meters high. This is a totally inappropriate location for these Pollution Stacks. The Rozelle Rail Yards are located in a valley. The Stacks will be on land that is approximately 3.5 meters above sea level. Balmain Road between Wharf Rd and Victoria Road is at an elevation of an average of 37 meters. Orange Grove Primary School is at an elevation of 33.4 meters. Areas of Hornsey Rd Rozelle are at 28 meters. Around the junction of Annandale St and Weynton St in Annandale the height above sea level is 29 meters. All these areas are in close proximity to these stacks. All the pollution being exhausted from these stacks will almost be on the same level as these locations and so will be blowing almost directly into these properties, especially in summer when many windows are open. This is not acceptable. In situations of no wind the pollution will accumulate in this valley area and make the surrounding area highly polluted. This is not acceptable. There are also at least 4 schools of Primary age children well within one kilometer of these Stacks. Young children are the most vulnerable to pollution related disease.

I object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that the works required (demolition and surface works) will create unacceptable and unbearable noise and vibration impacts for extended periods. The EIS indicates that at least 36 homes will basically be unliveable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.

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

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

EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The EIS states that the risk of ground settlement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35m (EIS Vol 2B App E p1). Yet the depths of tunnelling in streets leading to and around the Inner West Interchange are astonishingly low, e.g. John St at 22m, Emma St at 24m, Hill St at 28m, Moore St 27m, Piper St 37m, (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2), Catherine St at 26m (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1) - homes would indisputably sustain damage or cracking at these depths.

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

- Concentrations of some pollutants PM2.5 and PM10 are already near the current standard and in excess of proposed standards (p9-81, p9-93). It is critical to note that these particulates are a classified carcinogen and are known to have critical, and at times fatal, consequences if elevated. People living within 500 metres of heavily affected areas have demonstrably shorter lives, much higher incidences of chronic lung conditions and higher levels of cardiovascular diseases.

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

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

- The modelling conclusions are internally inconsistent. There is an assumption that traffic would dissipate at the edge of the motorway with no negative impacts on the CBD, Mascot and Alexandria. However there is also an assumption that additional roads would be needed to cope with said traffic.
Attention Director  
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  
Department of Planning and Environment  
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  

Name: Stacey Sullivan  
Address:  

Application Number: SSI 7485  
Suburb:  
Postcode: 2170  

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  
Signature:  

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

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

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

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

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

- Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.

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

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

- For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.

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

Name __________________________ Email __________________________ Mobile __________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

A. 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.

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

C. The justification for this project relies on the completion of other projects such as the Western Harbour Tunnel which has not yet been planned, let alone approved.

D. Are there other potentially serious problems with Sydney Water utility services (described at EIS 12-57) or with other utilities in other suburbs or along the proposed M4-M5 tunnel alignment? If so, the EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these are all disclosed, researched, surveyed and the resolution publicly published.

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

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

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

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

I. No road junction as large and complex as the extraordinary spaghetti junction proposed to go underground has been built anywhere in the world. The feasibility is not tested. There are no international or national standards for such a construction.
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application:

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

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

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

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

- The Rozelle Rail Yards are a totally inappropriate area to create a new recreational area because the area will be highly polluted by unfiltered Pollution Stacks and Tunnel Portals. In the EIS it is referred to as an idealized area. "It is envisaged that the quantum of active recreation within the Rozelle Rail Yards would be further developed by others as projects such as The Bays Precinct are developed. The concept plan provides spaces that could include an array of active recreation opportunities and even community facilities such as gardens or a school." The suggestion that this would be a suitable location for a School is just beyond belief and demonstrates that those who have put these plans together are either staggeringly ignorant or totally delusional! At a time when major World cities are doing all they can to address the dire problems of pollution this is an appalling suggestion that is totally out of touch.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

A. THE LATEST EIS WAS RELEASED JUST TEN BUSINESS DAYS AFTER FEEDBACK PERIOD ENDED FOR THE CONCEPT DESIGN FOR THE M4/M5 AND BEFORE PRELIMINARY DRILLING TO ESTABLISH A ROUTE THROUGH THE INNER WEST IS COMPLETED. WHAT IS THE RUSH? THIS EIS IS LITTLE MORE THAN A CONCEPT DESIGN AND IS FAR LESS DEVELOPED THAN EARLIER ONES. IT IS COMPOSED OF MANY INDICATE ONLY PLANS SUCH THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO KNOW WHAT THE IMPACTS WILL BE AND YET APPROVAL IS BEING SOUGHT IN A RUSH. THE EIS IGNORES MORE THAN 1500 SUBMISSIONS, INCLUDING ONE OF 142 PAGES FROM THE INNER WEST COUNCIL.

B. ONE TOLL ROAD LEADS TO ANOTHER 3 BEING PROPOSED. THE EIS'S FOR THE M4 EAST AND THE NEW M5 ARGUED THE CASE THAT SERIOUS CONGESTION CREATED NEAR INTERCHANGES WOULD BE SOLVED ONCE THE M4/M5 WAS BUILT. NOW IT SEEMS THIS IS NOT THE CASE AND MORE ROADS WILL BE NEEDED TO RELIEVE THE CONGESTION – WHERE DOES THIS END? ACCORDING TO THE M4/M5 EIS THE REAL BENEFITS WILL DEPEND ON BUILDING THE WESTERN HARBOUR TUNNEL, THE AIRPORT LINK AND A TOLLWAY HEADING SOUTH. NONE OF THESE PROJECTS HAVE BEEN PLANNED, LET ALONE APPROVED BUT YET ARE PART OF ADDRESSING THE CONGESTION IMPACTS ACKNOWLEDGED FOR THE M4/M5 LINK PROJECT. GIVEN THIS HOW IS IT POSSIBLE TO KNOW OR ADDRESS THE IMPACTS OF THE M4/M5 LINK, UNLESS THIS IS JUST YET MORE JUSTIFICATION FOR YET MORE ROADS?

C. RESEARCH ABOUT ROADS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATES THAT ROADS CREATE CONGESTION. THE WESTCONNEX PROJECT IS NO DIFFERENT AND THE EIS CLEARLY INDICATES THAT THIS IS AN IMPACT OF THE M4/M5 AND THE CONSEQUENT ROADS THAT WILL FOLLOW. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE M4/M5 LINK EIS ITSELF INDICATES THE RMS IS ALREADY HARD AT WORK CONSIDERING HOW TO SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS – OF CONGESTION CAUSED BY ROADS.

D. WHERE IS THE COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND TO LONG TERM PLANNING WHEN THE EIS FOR THE M4/M5 LINK IS RELEASED BEFORE ANY RESPONSE TO THE EXTENSIVE COMMUNITY FEEDBACK ON THE M4-M5 LINK CONCEPT DESIGN COULD POSSIBLY HAVE BEEN SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED. THIS DEMONSTRATES DEEP GOVERNMENT CONTEMPT FOR THE PEOPLE OF NSW AND THE COMMUNITIES OF THE INNER WEST OF SYDNEY IN PARTICULAR.

E. THE EIS WAS PREPARED BY GLOBAL ENGINEERING FIRM AECOM, WHICH ALSO PREPARED THE EIS FOR STAGES 1 AND 2. WHEN HE APPROVED THESE EARLIER STAGES, THE THEN MINISTER FOR PLANNING ROB STOKES POINTED TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THAT WOULD MINIMISE IMPACTS ON COMMUNITIES. BUT THE IMPACTS HAVE TURNED OUT TO WORSE THAN EXPECTED.

F. FOR EXAMPLE, THE AECOM EIS FOR THE NEW M5 FAILED TODeal WITH HOW THE MASSIVELY CONTAMINATED LAND FILL AT ALEXANDRIA WOULD BE MANAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION. AFTER MONTHS OF SICKENING ODOURS, THE NSW EPA ADMITS THAT DESPITE FINING SMC AND REQUIRING CONTRACTORS TO TAKE MEASURES TO CONTROL ODOURS, THEY HAVE NOT STOPPED. IT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT IT DOES NOT HAVE THE POWER TO STOP WORK UNTIL WESTCONNEX CONTRACTORS COMPLY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

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

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

- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

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

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

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

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

III. The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

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

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

VI. The EIS acknowledges that ‘rat running’ by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.

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

VIII. Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

A. THE LATEST EIS WAS RELEASED JUST TEN BUSINESS DAYS AFTER FEEDBACK PERIOD ENDED FOR THE Concept Design for the M4/M5 and before preliminary drilling to establish a route through the Inner West is completed. WHAT IS THE RUSH? This EIS is little more than a concept design and is far less developed than earlier ones. It is composed of many indicate only plans such that it is impossible to know what the impacts will be and yet approval is being sought in a rush. The EIS ignores more than 1500 submissions, including one of 142 pages from the Inner West Council.

B. ONE TOLL ROAD LEADS TO ANOTHER 3 BEING PROPOSED. The EIS's for the M4 East and the New M5 argued the case that serious congestion created near interchanges would be solved once the M4/M5 was built. Now it seems this is not the case and more roads will be needed to relieve the congestion – WHERE DOES THIS END? According to the M4/M5 EIS the real benefits will depend on building the Western Harbour Tunnel, the Airport Link and a tollway heading South. None of these projects have been planned, let alone approved but yet are part of addressing the congestion impacts acknowledged for the M4/M5 Link project. Given this how is it possible to know or address the impacts of the M4/M5 Link, unless this is just yet more justification for yet more roads?

C. RESEARCH ABOUT ROADS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATES THAT ROADS CREATE CONGESTION. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE M4/M5 Link EIS ITSELF INDICATES THE RMS IS ALREADY HARD AT WORK CONSIDERING HOW TO SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS – OF CONGESTION CAUSED BY ROADS.

D. WHERE IS THE COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND TO LONG TERM PLANNING WHEN THE EIS FOR THE M4/M5 Link is released before any response to the extensive community feedback on the M4-M5 Link concept design could possibly have been seriously considered. This demonstrates deep government contempt for the people of NSW and the communities of the Inner West of Sydney in particular.

E. THE EIS WAS PREPARED BY GLOBAL ENGINEERING FIRM AECOM, WHICH ALSO PREPARED THE EIS FOR STAGES 1 AND 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.

F. FOR EXAMPLE, THE AECOM EIS FOR THE NEW M5 FAILED TO DEAL WITH HOW THE MASSIVELY CONTAMINATED LAND FILL AT ALEXANDRIA WOULD BE MANAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The traffic modelling process is not fit for purpose and places significant risks on the people of NSW in terms of:
  - Traffic impacts that are significantly different to those presented in the EIS.
  - Toll earnings that are significantly lower than projections – resulting in government subsidising the owner for lost earnings.

- There is no statement on the level of accuracy and reliability of the traffic modelling process. This is a major shortcoming and is contrary to the Secretary’s Environmental Assessments Requirements. Westconnex traffic modelling relies on implausible traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the road links and intersections at several key locations.

- The great number of heritage houses in the Rozelle interchange construction zone has not been specifically addressed. Noise and vibration impacts can have far more significant impacts on these types of properties. There is no functional management plan for these risks, no articulated complaints investigation process nor any articulated compensation and remediation strategy.

- This is despite the RMS being the client for the Sydney Motorways Corporation. It would appear this is a deliberate strategy of the NSW Government to ensure local communities affected by construction traffic have no reasonable means of managing any complaint. It is undemocratic, against the principles of open government espoused in the election platform of the current government and ultimately escalates community unrest. (P 8-44)

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

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

- The project objectives (Part 3.3 of EIS) include enabling the construction of motorways over the harbour and to the northern beaches. However, the traffic impacts of these motorways in Rozelle have not been assessed. These projects were not part of the business case that justified the WestConnex in the first place. This constant shifting of reasoning as to why the project is justified points to a desperation to find a reason to build it, rather than there being a clear need to be serviced.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: 

Signature: 

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

Address: 261254 New Canterbury Rd, Leichsham 2014

Postcode: 2014

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

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

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

Sydney have a real alternative in public transport. This is just gouging western Sydney road users to make the road attractive to a buyer.

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

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

❖ SMC refuses to release the traffic model and detailed analysis for independent unpaid peer review and scenario analysis. The narrow boundaries of the areas of operational modelling mean the proponents have not fully assessed the Project’s impacts on key strategic centres such as the Sydney Central Business District. It is not understood why a mesoscopic modelling approach was not undertaken to gain a better understanding of impacts to the surrounding road network.

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

❖ All traffic modelling is wrong, the question is: by how much? And what are the implications of the error? Incorrect traffic modelling has led to overoptimistic traffic predictions which resulted in low toll revenue from of the Cross City Tunnel, Lane Cove Tunnel and Brisconnex in Brisbane, resulting in eventual bankruptcy. The traffic modelling process used to develop the Project is fundamentally flawed because:

❖ Traffic projections are likely to be significantly different to the actual traffic on the street network
❖ Traffic volumes projected in the model are in numerous instances well above the physical capacity of the road network.

❖ I object to this new tollway project because it will not reduce traffic, simply move it around. If they were serious about reducing traffic in Parramatta Rd they would put a toll on it and make the new roads free to encourage the traffic to use the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Recently Andrew Constance has been quoted numerous times promoting his vision of the transport future and some of these views are aired in the EIS but the vision put forward is highly visionary with no practical detail addressing how these changes are going to be brought about and so they are totally unrealistic. For example it is starting to be commonly accepted that car manufacturers will be reducing production of petrol/diesel cars before 2040 probably starting in 2030. It is proposed that electric cars will then take over. It is suggested that cars will be charged over night at people's homes. Virtually no one in the Inner City Suburbs has a garage. Are all the streets throughout all the suburbs going to be fitted out with charging points outside all the houses, similar to parking meters? We have all watched the shambles of the rolling out of the NBN it would be mind blowing to watch what would happen with the rolling out of charging points to each household without a garage and it would take years to achieve. There are virtually no recharging points at any Fuel Stations anywhere as yet and to set these up will take years. A large part of the population run older cars, because that is all they are able to afford. It will take many years for these petrol/diesel cars to disappear. Andrew Constance has also said that when everyone is driving an autonomous car average speeds will be reduced but as they are not being controlled by individual drivers this will mean they will be able to travel much closer together and so there will not be so much delay caused by spread out congestion. If this is to be so perhaps the suggestion could be made that some mechanism could be employed which would enable these cars to link together; if that could be done then they could form -a TRAIN- and then really travel at speed!
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents. (page 106)

- Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat – the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.

- I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.
Attention Director  
Application Number: SSI 7485  

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

---

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

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

- It all very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.

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

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

- Traffic diversions – Leichhardt. The EIS states that ‘temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction’ (6-65). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents. Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.

---

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

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

Name: GRETCHEN CARRIGAN

Signature: 

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

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

Address: 637/221 Sydney Park Rd

Suburb: Erskineville

Postcode: 2043

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

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

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

The removal of spoil from the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to the largest number of spoil truck movements on the entire Stage 3 project: 517 Heavy truck movements a day, of which 46 are stated to take place during peak hours. This will lead to extra noise and air pollution in this area.

The money spent on this stage could have been spent on modernizing the railway signal system so the train service could be improved which would benefit the communities west of Parramatta. What commuters out west really need is an extension of the heavy rail train system. I object that we were never given a choice about it.

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

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

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

Name: GRETCHEN CARRIGAN
Address: 637/221 Sydney Park Rd
Suburb: Erskineville
Postcode: 2043

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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

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

- I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.
- The proponent excludes the impact of the Western Sydney Airport from analysis of the project. This could have a significant impact on traffic volumes.
- The modelling shows significant increases in traffic on Victoria Rd (+20% ADT) which is already at capacity.
- Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.
- Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.
- The modelling shows the motorway exceeds reasonable operating limits in the peak in less than ten years.
- The key intersection performance tables in App H (p.258 St Peters and 248 Rozelle) demonstrate that many intersections will either worsen (at the worst case scenario of LOS F) or remain unchanged particularly in 2033, including the following intersections:
  - Princes Highway/Canal Road
  - Princes Highway/Railway Road
  - Unwins Bridge Road/Campbell Street
  - Campbell Road/Bourke Road
  - Princes Highway/Campbell Street
  - Ricketty Street/Kent Road
  - Gardeners Road/Kent Road
  - Gardeners Road/Bourke Road
  - Gardeners Rd/O'Riordan Street
  - Victoria Road/Lyons Road
  - Victoria Road/Darling Street
  - Victoria Road/Robert Street
- The underlying traffic modelling and outputs was insufficient to:
  - Demonstrate the need for the project.
  - Understand impacts of dispersed traffic on connecting roads, such as the Anzac Bridge, and whether they have available capacity to meet the predicted traffic discharge. Any congestion on exits has the capacity to negate all travel time savings to the exit point, given the small predicted benefits.
- Public transport is rejected by the EIS so the state government is forcing us to use cars more when most major cities in the world are trying to reduce the number of cars on the roads. We know this is to promote private road operators' profits. I object to putting so much public funding to the cause of private profit. I urge the Secretary of Planning to reject this project.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: GRETCHEN GREGSON

Signature: 

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

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

Address: 637/221 Sydney Park Rd, Erskineville

Suburb: Erskineville Postcode: 2043

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name: GREGORY CARTRIDGE

Signature: 

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

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

Address: 637/21 Sydney Park Rd

Suburb: Erskineville

Postcode: 2043

Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Attn: Director - Transport Assessments
Application Number: SSI 7485
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

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

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

Of the six areas of disturbance and 11 Historical Archaeological Management Units (HAMUs) identified in Chapter 26 of the EIS, none are within the Sydney LGA.

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

The EIS states that the impact on regional air quality is minimal and thus concludes that the project’s impact on ozone is negligible. Ozone is a major pollutant and Western Sydney, Campbelltown in particular, suffers the worst ozone pollution. Major components of ozone are generated in eastern Sydney and drift west. Previous environment departments have spoken about the need for an eight-hour standard concentration and goal for ozone (DECEW, 2010, State of Knowledge: Ozone). OEH needs to provide information about the value of this standard and on the impact of new motorways on that level.

The EIS (App H, p.269) refers to the RMS plans to carry out “network integration” works surrounding the Rozelle interchange once the project is complete but offers little detail of the nature of the works. It mentions the intersection of the Western Distributor and Pyrmont Bridge Road at Pyrmont, Western Distributor near Darling Harbour and a review of kerbside uses near Western Distributor, The Crescent, Johnston Street and Ross Street.

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

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

◊ The assessment of Strategic Alternative 2 (Investment in “alternative transport” modes) should:
   a. identify key network capacity issues
   b. identify the shift away from private vehicles required to deliver the necessary relief on the road network to meet the future transport needs of Sydney
   c. identify the mix of investments in public transport, cycling and walking required to deliver these mode splits.
   d. use multi-modal transport modelling and economic assessment to inform the analysis and assessment of the alternative.

◊ Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex, yet there are no detailed construction plans. It is not enough to say there will be mitigation if negative impacts unfold. An EIS should assess risks and be able to predict whether they are worth risking and if so, what mitigation should be necessary.

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

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

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

◊ The Concept Design was a woefully inadequate document totally devoid of any real depth of detail in terms of maps, scales, distances with only vague suggestions and glamorized Artist's Impressions of an idealized view of what Stage 3 would be like. It was another example of current city planning documents that consistently accentuate huge areas of tranquil green spaces with families and children out walking and riding bicycles in idealized parks and suburbs. All this is total PR spin and bears no reality about the real outcome of the build. It bears no reality as to what Stage 3 of Westconnex will be like.

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: GRETCHEN CARRICAN

Signature: ____________________________

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

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

Address: 637/21 Sydney Park Rd

Suburb: Erskineville

Postcode: 2043

I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.

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

It is quite clear that the escalating cost of tolls will encourage drivers to avoid tollways. This will further pollute and congest local roads. Such impact already evident on Parramatta Rd usage after the new M4 tolls were introduced. The community expects similar impacts on roads around the St Peters interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Enmore and Edgeware Roads and though streets of Alexandria and Erskineville. The EIS Traffic analysis fails to deal with this issue of traffic beyond the boundaries of the project and should be rejected.

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

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

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

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

Name: GRETCHEN CALLIGIAN

Signature: [Signature]

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

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

Address: 637/1221 Sydney Road, Enthu Ville 2048

Suburb: Enthu Ville

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically mention all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.

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

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

F. The EIS at 7-25 refers to 876 comments (limited to 140 characters) made via the collaborative map on the Concept Design 'up to July' that were considered in the preparation of the EIS. It does not mention the many hundreds of extended written submissions that were lodged in late July and early August. These critical 'community engagement' feedback submissions have clearly not been considered in the preparation of the EIS. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name:... 
Signature:...

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

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

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

I. The EIS at 7.51 refers to concerns that were raised by the community that the alignment of tunnels in Newtown appeared to go to the east of King Street, an area that had had no geotech drilling or testing. SMC staff indicated at Community information sessions that the maps included in the Concept Design were broad and indicative only, and that further details would be available in the EIS. No further details have been provided. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

II. The EIS at 7.41 acknowledges that there is great concern in the community that King Street, Newtown, will be made a 24 hour clearway, stating “Roads and Maritime has no plan to change the existing clearways on King Street”. This statement is deliberately misleading - it infers that SMC has authority in controlling impacts on regional roads. Roads and Maritime have the unfettered right to declare Clearways wherever and whenever they wish, and RMS has NEVER stated publicly that King Street will not be subject to extended clearway.

III. Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex, yet there are no detailed construction plans. It is not enough to say there will be mitigation if negative impacts unfold. An EIS should assess risks and be able to predict whether they are worth risking and if so, what mitigation should be necessary.

IV. It is quite clear that the escalating cost of tolls will encourage drivers to avoid tollways. This will further pollute and congest local roads. Such impact already evident on Parramatta Rd usage after the new M4 tolls were introduced. The community expects similar impacts on roads around the St Peters interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Enmore and Edgware Roads and though streets of Alexandria and Erskineville. The EIS Traffic analysis fails to deal with this issue of traffic beyond the boundaries of the project and should be rejected.

V. Increased traffic congestion in areas around portals will increase pollution along roadsides, with predicted adverse impacts on breathing and through long-term carcinogenic effects. The maps and analysis of the pollution effects in the EIS should be presented in a way that enables them to be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.

VI. EIS is Indicative only - The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

I. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement may occur. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The EIS states that 'settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment'. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres. This proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. In addition, the EIS states that there are a number of discrete areas to the north and northwest of the Rozelle Rail Yards, to the north of Campbell Road at St Peters and in the vicinity of Lord Street at Newtown where ground water movement above 20 milliliters is predicted 'strict limits on the degree of settlement permitted would be imposed on the project' and 'damage' would be rectified at no cost to the owner. would be placed (Executive Summary, xvii -iii). The project should not be permitted to be delivered in such a way that there is a known risk to property damage that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level of risk.

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

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

IV. Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. There must be a review of the NSW government's unacceptable policy on this issue. I am appalled that the ex Minister for Planning Rob Stokes who approved the New M5 and unfiltered stacks in St Peters and Haberfield would declare that he would not have them in his own area. How can residents have any trust in a process that is underpinned by such hypocrisy.

V. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters Interchange will have a heavy disruptive impact on the local transport routes, whether by vehicle, bus, or active transport (walking and cycling).
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

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

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

- The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

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

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

- The EIS acknowledges that ‘rat running’ by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.

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

- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

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

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

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

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

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

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

V. The EIS acknowledges that impacts of construction should M4/M5 get approval will worsen traffic congestions on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it would be outrageous for motorists to be asked to pay up to up to $20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.

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

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

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

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

- The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.

- The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.

- The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

- It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

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

- The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

---

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

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

Name: Preston Wang
Signature: 

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

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

Address: 174A Cook Rd, Elyseah Bay
Suburb: Elyseah Bay Postcode: 2031

There will be 517 Heavy truck movements a day, of which 46 are stated to take place during peak hours from the Rozelle Rail Yard, the largest amount of spoil truck movement on the whole of Stage 3. This will lead to a vast amount of extra noise and air pollution in this area. There will also be disturbance of soil in the old Rozelle Goods Yard which will be heavily contaminated with toxic substances. It is highly probable that there will be 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 the EIS makes no provision for their safe removal in this area.

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

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

The cited ‘key customers’ that would benefit from the project (long distance, freight, businesses) represent a very small minority of those who are forecast to actually use the project (single occupancy commuter vehicles). The key customers could be served by a far more modest project, given they represent an extremely small proportion of projected traffic on the Project.

The EIS (Section 3.2) does not set out the specific transport needs addressed by the project but states additional road capacity is required to meet a projected increase in trips. It does not set out any trips, desire lines, demand corridors or growth that the WestConnex project is addressing. As a result it is not possible to assess the project’s ability to meet those needs. Nor is it demonstrated that projections in growth in population and employment correlate to traffic demand increase along the proposed M4-M5 Link.
I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS.

Name: ROSEMARY KING

Signature: 

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

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

Address: 1 MARTIN ST.

Suburb: HABERFIELD

Postcode... 2045

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

Attn: Director — Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name

Email

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

Signature: Ann Walker

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

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

Address: 2812 Northwood Street

Suburb: Camperdown

Postcode: 2050

a) I am concerned that while hundreds of impacts on resident, including noise, loss of business, dust, and lost time through more traffic congestion, are identified in the EIS, the approach is always to recommend approval and promise vague ‘mitigation’ in the future. This is not good enough.

b) The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

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

d) The site should be returned to the community as compensation for the imposition of this construction site in our neighbourhood for a 5 year period. If the substation and water treatment plant is moved to the north of the site, then the lower half of the site (which is the most accessible end) could be converted into open space with mature trees planted. As this site is immediately adjacent to the bay run, bicycle parking and other facilities that support active transport could be included. This would result increase the green space for residents and result in a pleasant green environment for pedestrians, rather than a fenced facility.

e) The City West Link Eastbound AM and PM peak hour and other locations. “Table 7-19 shows that several locations are forecast to exceed theoretical roadway capacity with the increased background traffic and the construction traffic in the 2021 AM and PM peak hours. However, traffic on the majority of these roads would exceed their theoretical capacity even without the construction traffic, simply due to the growth in background traffic”. So in the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, massive amounts of construction traffic are going to be added for the whole construction period of 5 years. Even on completion it is stated in the EIS that traffic will be worse in this area than ‘without the project’. This categorically shows that the planning of Westconnex is totally inadequate and needs major changes. It also shows that when completed Westconnex will not work. It is abundantly obvious that Rail/Metro is the only option to radically overhaul Sydney’s failed transport systems.
I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS

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

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

3. I am concerned that the EIS provides no reasons why the City of Sydney's alternative plan might not be preferable to the proposed WestCONnex.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. The Concept Design was a woefully inadequate document totally devoid of any real depth of detail in terms of maps, scales, distances with only vague suggestions and glamorized Artist's Impressions of an idealized view of what Stage 3 would be like. It was another example of current city planning documents that consistently accentuate huge areas of tranquil green spaces with families and children out walking and riding bicycles in idealized parks and suburbs. All this is total PR spin and bears no reality about the real outcome of the build. It bears no reality as to what Stage 3 of Westconnex will be like.

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

3. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres underground. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 27metres. Piper St 37metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2)

Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

◊ I object to the assessment of the removal of buildings, other rail infrastructure and vegetation on the Rozelle Railway Yards being done in advance of this EIS. The RMS environmental assessment process is not publicly accountable. These works were part of the WestConnex project and should have been assessed as part of Stage 3.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

I object to this project that the state government keeps telling us is for western Sydney when it forces high tolls on us and doesn't even include the link to Port Botany or Sydney Airport, and that was supposed to be the reason for the WestConnex project in the first place.

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

The high tolls are set to increase by the CPI or by 4% a year, whichever is higher. When inflation is low and wages are not even keeping up with low inflation this is outrageous. Commuters or workers of western Sydney do not have an adequate alternative in public transport. This is just gouging western Sydney road users to make the road project attractive to a buyer.

I object to the tolls which are unfair when people living west of Parramatta really need alternative transport to travel north-south to the western neighborhoods. If we had better local public transport then many of us would not have to drive and this would reduce the traffic. We need more bus services to connect our suburbs.

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

The original objectives of the project were supposed to be improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. We now have the proposals for all three stages and none of them includes access to either Port Botany or Sydney Airport. The community is asked to support this proposal on the basis of more unfunded future projects, and there isn't even a plan for the Sydney Gateway on a map.

The KPMG and Ernst & Young studies cited by the EIS say NSW's toll roads contributed $14 billion in benefits over ten years but no details of how this is worked out are provided. Of course the toll roads benefitted Transurban which owns most of them but where is the public interest in efficient transport, reduced vehicle emissions and reduced traffic taken into account?

Why is the answer to traffic jams always another road, and now another private tollway? WestConnex is not a solution and I object to the state using public funds to enrich a private corporation.

Can the Planning Department please not approve this wasteful project.

---

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

Name _______________________________ Email _______________________________ Mobile ____________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application #551 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: John Minnis 02
Signature: [Signature]

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

Address: 17/2-13 Cowper St Newtown 2042
Suburb: Newtown
Postcode: 2042

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

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

All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to falls Street) should have a blanket prohibition on any truck movements and worker contractor parking. These homes are already suffering the worst construction impacts of the work on the site and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and additional noise impacts. These streets are not constructed for heavy vehicle movements and on this basis should also be ruled out. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all of these streets.

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

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

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

Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates and unacceptable risk of damage to homes due to settlement (ground movement). The EIS acknowledges that at tunnelling at 35 metres and less this is a real risk. There is no mitigation provided for this risk. Instead, it states that properties will be repaired at the Government's expense. However no details or assurance as to how this will occur are provided. The project should not be approved with such tunnelling depths permitted and with no detail as to the extent of damage and how and when it will be repaired. It will lead to the situation where residents and businesses are forced to engage structural engineers and lawyers to prove that the damage was linked to Westconnex works, with no assurance that this property damage will be promptly and satisfactorily fixed.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Signature: KAREN MCLEOD

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

Address: 52 Leoney Rd

Suburb: LEONAY Postcode 2750

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

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

c) There have been widespread reports in the media about extensive unresolved disputes regarding damages to houses in the Stage 1 M4 and Stage 2 M5 construction process. Why should the community believe that there will not be extensive damages to houses in Stage 3?

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

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

f) The justification for this project relies on the completion of other projects such as the Western Harbour Tunnel which has not yet been planned, let alone approved.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name: Esme BUNDA
Signature: __________________________

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

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

Address: 56 Cambridge St
Suburb: Stanmore

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

⇒ Recently Andrew Constance has been quoted numerous times promoting his vision of the transport future and some of these views are aired in the EIS but the vision put forward is highly visionary with no practical detail addressing how these changes are going to be brought about and so they are totally unrealistic. For example it is starting to be commonly accepted that car manufacturers will be reducing production of petrol/diesel cars before 2040 probably starting in 2030. It is proposed that electric cars will then take over. It is suggested that cars will be charged over night at people’s homes. Virtually no one in the Inner City Suburbs has a garage. Are all the streets throughout all the suburbs going to be fitted out with charging points outside all the houses, similar to parking meters? We have all watched the shambles of the rolling out of the NBN it would be mind blowing to watch what would happen with the rolling out of charging points to each household without a garage and it would take years to achieve. There are virtually no recharging points at any Fuel Stations anywhere as yet and to set these up will take years. A large part of the population run older cars, because that is all they are able to afford. It will take many years for these petrol/diesel cars to disappear. Andrew Constance has also said that when everyone is driving an autonomous car average speeds will be reduced but as they are not being controlled by individual drivers this will mean they will be able to travel much closer together and so there will not be so much delay caused by spread out congestion. If this is to be so perhaps the suggestion could be made that some mechanism could be employed which would enable these cars to link together; if that could be done then they could form a TRAIN and then really travel at speed!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

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

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

- The EIS acknowledges that ‘rat running’ by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.

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

- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

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

B. The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.

C. The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.

D. The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

E. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

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

G. The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

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

Name ___________________________ Email ___________________________ Mobile ___________________________
Attention Director  
Attention Director  
Attention Director  
Attention Director  
Attention Director  
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,  
Department of Planning and Environment  
Department of Planning and Environment  
Department of Planning and Environment  
Department of Planning and Environment  
Department of Planning and Environment  
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

vi. EIS social impact study states that “the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas' - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

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

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

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

- Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat - the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.

- I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.

- I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

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

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

- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

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

- An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow 'swoosh' that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be ‘encouraged’ to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that ‘definitive’ rather than ‘indicative’ alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair ‘definitive’ document open for genuine public comment.
I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

Name: [Signature]

Address: [Address]

Suburb: [Suburb]

Postcode: [Postcode]

All traffic modelling is wrong, the question is: by how much? And what are the implications of the error? Incorrect traffic modelling has led to overoptimistic traffic predictions which resulted in low toll revenue from of the Cross City Tunnel, Lane Cove Tunnel and Brisconnex in Brisbane, resulting in eventual bankruptcy. The traffic modelling process used to develop the Project is fundamentally flawed because:

a) Traffic projections are likely to be significantly different to the actual traffic on the street network
b) Traffic volumes projected in the model are in numerous instances well above the physical capacity of the road network.

The EIS asserts that the M4-M5 link would complete the orbital road network between western Sydney and the eastern gateways of Port Botany and Sydney Airport (p4.4). That orbital already exists in the form of the 110km Sydney Orbital - the M2, M7, M5, Eastern Distributor, Harbour Tunnel, Gore Hill Freeway and Lane Cove Tunnel.

Generally the risk of settlement is lessened where tunnelling is more that 35m. In the Rozelle area the tunnel will be at 30m in the Brockley St & Cheltenham St area, and it will be less than that in the Denison St area. Also it is planned to have another layer of tunnels above that in the Denison St area. From the cross section diagram Vol 2B appendix E part 2 the suggestion is that this higher level of tunnels will be at no more than 12m. This is of major concern. Numbers of people in the ongoing construction of Stage 1 and 2 have suffered extensive damage to their homes costing thousands of dollars to rectify caused by vibration and tunneling activities and although they followed all the elected procedures their claims have not been settled. This is totally unacceptable. There is nothing addressing these major concerns in the EIS.

The EIS was released just 12 days after the closing date for submissions to the Concept Design. This proves the Concept Design and the submissions were a sham. There were hundreds of posts on the interactive map and there were over thousand written submissions. There is no way these submissions could have been read, evaluated, their points integrated, and the 7500 page EIS edited, printed, checked and distributed in 12 days. The EIS was obviously prepared prior to the closing of submission to the Concept Design. This is a total abuse of the NSW Planning Laws.

The introduction of the EIS clearly states that the information in the EIS is "indicative" of the final design only. The reality of this statement means that the project may be completely different to stated plans in the EIS. Furthermore although the EIS indicates what is to be expected when construction begins, it also states that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed upon. This may result in major changes to the project design and construction methodologies. The community would have no say in this process.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application
# SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Stephen Spencer
Signature:

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

Address: 3/44 Loftus Street
Suburb: Wollongong
Postcode: 2500

At very minimum, the assessment of Strategic Alternative 1 (improvements to the existing arterial road network) should:

- Identify key network capacity issues.
- Develop a scenario of investments in (potentially major) arterial road improvements required to address the road network capacity constraints. The City of Sydney's alternative scheme provides one example of what improvements to the existing arterial road network might look like.
- Carry out transport modelling and economic analysis to inform the assessment of the alternative.

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

The presence of 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day at this site will create an unacceptable risk to students. The EIS should not permit any truck movements near the Darley Road site. The alternative proposal which provides that all spoil trucks enter and leave from the City West link is the only proposal that should be considered.

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

The EIS at 7-21 states that Community update Newsletters were distributed to residents 'near the project footprint' in many suburbs. This statement is simply not correct. No such newsletters were received by residents in central and northern Newtown. SMC was made aware of this fact, but has not responded to verbal and written requests for audited confirmation of the addresses 'letterboxed'. This statement of community engagement should be rejected by the Department.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name: STEPHEN SPENCER

Signature: 

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

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

Address: 3/44 Loftus Street

Suburb: WOLLONGONG

Postcode 2500

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

Because of the high tolls drivers who have to travel east daily will look for alternative routes and build up the traffic on local roads, both here in western Sydney, on Parramatta Rd and all the way to the city. There is no way the WestConnex roads will reduce traffic on un-tolled roads with tolls on the WestConnex sections so high.

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

Increased traffic congestion in areas around portals will increase pollution along roadsides, with predicted adverse impacts on breathing and through long-term carcinogenic effects. The maps and analysis of the pollution effects in the EIS should be presented in a way that enables them to be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.

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

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an ‘indicative’ and fundamentally flawed EIS.

Name: STEPHEN SPENCER

Signature: [Signature]

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

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

Address: 3/144 LAFTY STREET

Postcode: 2000

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

Attn: Director — Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

- The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.

- There is no evidence of scenario modelling being used to allow testing the ability of different packages of integrated transport measures to achieve outcomes. The Long Term Transport Masterplan states that integrated approaches are required to manage congestion. The NSW Minister for Transport claims that we “have to get more people on public transport.”

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

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

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

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

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

- The EIS states that there may be a 'small increase in pollutant concentrations' near surface roads. The EIS states that potential health impacts associated with changes in air quality (specifically nitrogen dioxide and particulates) within the local community have been assessed and are considered to be 'acceptable.' We disagree that the impacts on human health are acceptable and object to the project in its entirety because of these impacts.

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

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

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

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

- The EIS lacks sufficient focus on traffic congestion in the suburbs of Alexandria and Erskineville. Are these being ignored because they will be even more congested than currently.
I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS

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

◊ EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the Process for addressing project uncertainties. “The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in Chapter 1, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval”. The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these ‘uncertainties’ have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The WestConnex program of works has been described as an integrated transport network solution. However, the role and interdependency with public transport and freight rail is not considered. The recent Government commitment to a Metro West requires a rethink on the need for WestConnex. Particularly as the WestConnex business case outlines a mode shift from public transport to the toll road as a benefit required to justify it economically.

- While WestConnex might integrate with the wider motorway network, no evidence is provided demonstrating that it integrates with the wider road network – let alone the broader transport and land use system. For example the EIS provides no information about changes in traffic volumes entering the Sydney CBD caused by WestConnex. RMS has only just commenced work to identify which roads fanning out from WestConnex portals will need to be upgraded to deliver large numbers of vehicles to and from the project. It is therefore impossible to form a properly informed understanding of the environmental impacts – the very purpose of the EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

◊ 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.

◊ Traffic operational modelling – Leichhardt. The EIS does not provide any operational modelling for the Darley Road area (8-11), despite the fact 170 vehicles a day are proposed to enter this highly congested (during peak hours) area. Darley Road is a critical arterial road for commuters accessing the City West Link and this analysis should be provided so that impacts can be properly assessed.

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

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

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

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

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

- Other planning issues are excluded from cost-benefit analysis, which is a key component of developing a business case:
  
  a. No analysis of equity impacts of the infrastructure investment and the tolling regime, given the lower socio-economic status of many areas of Western Sydney, and the requirement for potential users of WestConnex to own or pay for access to a private vehicle to be able to use it
  b. The localised impact of air quality around the ventilation outlets should have been accounted for.
  c. Impacts associated with loss of amenity from reduced access to open space should have been accounted for.

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

- Unreliable traffic projections lead to significant and compounding errors in the design, EIS and business case processes, including:
  
  a. Dimensioning of motorway tunnels and interchanges (on- and off-ramps) and expansion of roads feeding traffic to and discharging traffic from the toll road
  b. Assessment of the project’s traffic impacts on other parts of the street network
  c. Assessment of overall traffic generation and induced traffic associated with the project
  d. Emissions based on traffic volume and driving style (e.g. stop-start driving in congested traffic leads to higher emissions impacts)
  e. Toll earnings and financial viability, which could trigger compensation claims or negotiated underwriting that would materially undermine the State budget position given the cost of the project.
  f. Other key inputs to the business case that are derived from strategic traffic modelling, including: purported reductions in crashes, purported improvements in productivity etc.

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

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

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

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

- Why are two different options being suggested for Haberfield? It is clear that both of these are unacceptable and will expose residents to unnecessary traffic danger, congestion and disruption with capacity to enjoy their homes and environment. It is insulting that the EIS acknowledges this but offers no solution other than to go ahead.

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

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

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

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

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

- A lot of work has gone into building cycling and pedestrian routes in Rozelle and Annandale. Interference and disruption of routes for four years is not a 'temporary' imposition.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

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

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

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

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

- The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres underground. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 27metres, Piper St 37metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

- The EIS projects increases in freight volumes without offering evidence as to how the project enables this. Assertions relating to improvements for freight services rely on the Sydney Gateway Project, which is not part of WestConnex, and which poses significant threats to the crucial freight rail connection to Port Botany. Port Botany itself has questioned whether the current project provides any benefit to it.
I submit my strongest objections to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: STEPHEN SPENCER

Signature: 

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

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

Address: 3/44 LOFTUS STREET

Suburb: WOLLONGONG Postcode: 2500

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

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

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

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

Name _____________________________ Email _____________________________ Mobile _____________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

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

- The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

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

- It all very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- 1,1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

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

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

- I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation. M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

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

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

- I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community’s feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.

- Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex, yet there are no detailed construction plans. It is not enough to say there will be mitigation if negative impacts unfold. An EIS should assess risks and be able to predict whether they are worth risking and if so, what mitigation should be necessary.

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

- SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

- The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in Chapter 1, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval”. The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these ‘uncertainties’ have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.

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

- Why the so called ‘King Street Gateway’ been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects?

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

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

Name: STEFANIE BROWN

Signature: 

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Address: 61 Laura St

Suburb: Newtown

Postcode: 2042

1. There have been widespread reports in the media about extensive unresolved disputes regarding damages to houses in the Stage 1 M4 and Stage 2 M5 construction process. Why should the community believe that there will not be extensive damages to houses in Stage 3?

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

3. It is quite clear that the escalating cost of tolls will encourage drivers to avoid tollways. This will further pollute and congest local roads. Such impact already evident on Parramatta Rd usage after the new M4 tolls were introduced. The community expects similar impacts on roads around the St Peters interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Enmore and Edgeware Roads and though streets of Alexandria and Erskineville.

4. It is very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.

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

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

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

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

9. I am deeply disappointed that the EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, ‘would’ not ‘will’, telling me nothing is actually ‘known’ for certain. This is a dangerous and reckless attempt to get approval for a project that is yet to be properly designed.

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

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

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

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

2. Hundreds of risks associated with this project have not been assessed but have instead been deferred to a detailed design stage into which the public will have no input. I call on the Department of Planning to reject this inadequate EIS that has been prepared by AECOM that has multiple commercial interests in WestConnex.

3. The EIS at 7-25 refers to 876 comments (limited to 140 characters) made via the collaborative map on the Concept Design 'up to July' that were considered in the preparation of the EIS. It does not mention the many hundreds of extended written submissions that were lodged in late July and early August. These critical 'community engagement' feedback submissions have clearly not been considered in the preparation of the EIS. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

4. Increased traffic congestion in areas around portals will increase pollution along road sides, with predicted adverse impacts on breathing and through long-term carcinogenic effects. The maps and analysis of the pollution effects in the EIS should be presented in a way that enables them to be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.

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

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

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

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

9. Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. There must be a review of the NSW government's unacceptable policy on this issue. I am appalled that the ex Minister for Planning Rob Stokes who approved the New M5 and unfiltered stacks in St Peters and Haberfield would declare that he would not have them in his own area. How can residents have any trust in a process that is underpinned by such hypocrisy.

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

Other Comments I would like to make:

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, 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.

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

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

- 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application

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

2. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement may occur. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The EIS states that ‘settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment’. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres. This proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. In addition, the EIS states that there are a number of discrete areas to the north and northwest of the Rozelle Rail Yards, to the north of Campbell Road at St Peters and in the vicinity of Lord Street at Newtown where ground water movement above 20 milliliters is predicted ‘strict limits on the degree of settlement permitted would be imposed on the project” and ‘damage’ would be rectified at no cost to the owner. would be placed (Executive Summary, xvii -iii). The project should not be permitted to be delivered in such a way that there is a known risk to property damage that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level of risk.

3. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

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

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

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

7. 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used...The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective.

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

Name ____________________ Email ____________________ Mobile ____________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

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

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

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

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

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

- Crash statistics – City West Link and James St intersection. The EIS only analyses crash statistics near the interchanges. It does not provide any detail as to the number of crashes at the James St/City West Link intersection which, on Transport for NSW’s own figures, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Nor does it comment on the two fatalities that occurred on Darley Road near the proposed construction site. The EIS needs to detail the increased risk in crashes that will be caused by the additional 170 vehicles a day that are proposed to enter and leave Darley Road during the construction period.

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

A. I am concerned that while the EIS finds that tolls do weigh more heavily on lower income motorists, there is no serious analysis of the blatant unfairness of letting of private consortium toll people for decades in order to pay for less profitable tollways for wealthier communities.

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

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

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

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

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

| Name: | Linda Cowan |
| Signature: | 6 Chaldey Street |
| Address: | Newtown |
| Suburb: | Linda Cowan |
| Postcode: | 2042 |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I have not made reportable political donations in the last 2 years. | |

| Application Name: | WestConnex M4-M5 Link |
| Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 | |
| Application Number: | SSI 7485 |
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- 1,1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- A lot of work has gone into building cycling and pedestrian routes in Rozelle and Annandale. Interference and disruption of routes for four years is not a 'temporary' imposition.
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
Attention Director  
Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

- 1,1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat - the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.

- I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission from:</th>
<th>Submission to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Linda Cavan</td>
<td>Planning Services,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: [Signature]</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Attention Director
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

| Name: | LINDA CONNAH |
| Address: | C AMBROSE 37 |
| Application Number: SSI 7485 |
| Suburb: | W B STOWN |
| Postcode: | 2012 |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link |

Signature: [Signature]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.

C. The EIS states “Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle.” Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.

D. The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

E. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

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

G. The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

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

Name __________________________ Email __________________________ Mobile __________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

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

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

- The EIS acknowledges that 'rat running' by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.

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

- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

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

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

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

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

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

- Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat – the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.

- I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.

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

- I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project. There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51,000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Peters and Haberfield or Rozelle, all traffic going to the CBD, East or into the Inner West will use local roads.

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

- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. There have been widespread reports in the media about extensive unresolved disputes regarding damages to houses in the Stage 1 M4 and Stage 2 M5 construction process. Why should the community believe that there will not be extensive damages to houses in Stage 3?

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

3. It is quite clear that the escalating cost of tolls will encourage drivers to avoid tollways. This will further pollute and congest local roads. Such impact already evident on Parramatta Rd usage after the new M4 tolls were introduced. The community expects similar impacts on roads around the St Peters interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Enmore and Edgeware Roads and though streets of Alexandria and Erskineville. The EIS Traffic analysis fails to deal with this issue of traffic beyond the boundaries of the project and should be rejected.

4. It all very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.

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

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

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

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

9. I am deeply disappointed that the EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, "would" not "will", telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain. This is a dangerous and reckless attempt to get approval for a project that is yet to be properly designed.

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

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

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

Name: **Laura Bouskila**

Signature: **Laura Bouskila**

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

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

Address: 213/1 George St 

Suburb: Newtown  Postcode: 2042

---

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

- The mechanical ventilation proposed depends on single direction tunnel construction, so how it can possibly work for large curved tunnels on multiple levels is unknown.

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

- The EIS proposes removal of all vegetation on the Darley Road site. There is a mature tree located on the site which serves as a visual and noise barrier to the heavy City West Link traffic. Removal of this tree and other vegetation will increase noise impacts to nearby residents and affect the visual amenity, with homes having a direct line of sight to the City West Link. The existing mature tree needs to be retained on this and environmental grounds.

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

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

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

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

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

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

- The assessment states that there will be a net increase in GHG emissions in 2023 under the ‘with project’ scenario, however under the 2023 ‘cumulative’ scenario, there will be a net decrease in emissions (page 22-15). However, as the ‘cumulative’ scenario includes the Sydney Gateway and Western Harbor Tunnel projects, which are not yet confirmed to proceed, the ‘with project’ scenario should be considered as a likely outcome – which would see an increase in emissions. Both scenarios for 2033 show a reduction in emissions vs the ‘do minimum’ scenario. This is likely to rely on ‘free-flow’ conditions for the Project for most of the day. Should this not occur, the modelled outcomes could be significantly different.

- Increased traffic on Gardeners Road will require land use planning changes that may decrease the value of land.

- Recent experience tells us that numbers of people in the ongoing construction of Stages 1 and 2 have suffered extensive damage to their homes caused by vibration, tunnelling activities, and changed soil moisture content costing thousands of dollars to rectify, and although they followed all the elected procedures their claims have not been settled. Insurance policies will not cover this type of damage. The onus has been on them to prove that damage to their homes was caused by Westconnex. Furthermore, the EIS actually concedes that there will be moisture drawdown caused by tunnelling. There is nothing addressing these major concerns in the EIS. This is what residents in Annandale, Leichhardt and Lilyfield are facing and it is totally unacceptable.

- The statements made that public transport cannot serve diverse areas are empirically incorrect. The area the Westconnex is being built in has higher public transport mode use than the Greater Metropolitan Area as noted in the IES.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485 for the reasons set out below.

Name: Debby Eguav
Signature: [Signature]

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

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

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

The Rozelle Rail Yards site is the location of 3 Unfiltered Pollution Stacks. There is a fourth stack on Victoria Rd close to Darling St. If the Western Harbour Tunnel is built there will also be a total of 7 Tunnel Portals. Tunnel Portals are also areas of high levels of pollution. It is totally unacceptable that the Pollution Stacks are unfiltered. In 2008 Gladys Berejiklian said of Labor “It’s not too late, the Government can still ensure that filtration is a possibility. World’s best practice is to filter tunnels. Why won’t Labor allow people to sleep at night, knowing their children aren’t inhaling toxins that could jeopardize their health now or in the future.” It is totally unacceptable that the tunnels will not be filtered. Recently built tunnels in Tokyo successfully filter 98% of all pollutants.

Generally the risk of settlement is lessened where tunnelling is more that 35m. In the Rozelle area the tunnel will be at 30m in the Brockley St & Cheltenham St area, and it will be less than that in the Denison St area. Also it is planned to have another layer of tunnels above that in the Denison St area. From the cross section diagram Vol 2B appendix E part 2 the suggestion is that this higher level of tunnels will be at no more than 12m. This is of major concern. Numbers of people in the ongoing construction of Stage 1 and 2 have suffered extensive damage to their homes costing thousands of dollars to rectify caused by vibration and tunneling activities and although they followed all the elected procedures their claims have not been settled. This is totally unacceptable. There is nothing addressing these major concerns in the EIS.

The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement “may occur, further stating that “settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment”. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres underground. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 27metres. Piper St 37metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

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

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

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

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

b) For example The St Peters / Sydney Park Interchange will overload the Mascot road network. As a result traffic levels were reduced to fit the modelling.

c) It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

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

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

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

1. 11599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

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

3. 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

4. 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used. The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

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

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns. My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.
I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

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

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

- Better use of existing road infrastructure has not been analysed as a feasible alternative. The EIS only refers to existing RMS programs. An analysis of urban road projects recommended in the State Infrastructure Strategy Update 2014 should be conducted as strategic alternatives including:
  - Smart Motorways investments on the M4, the Warringah Freeway and Southern Cross Drive-General Holmes Drive
  - Upgrading the Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic System (SCATS)

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

- The EIS refers to benefits from road projects that are not part of the project’s scope. The full costs, benefits and impacts of these projects need to be considered in a transparent process.

- The method and logic used to develop and assess the Project is similar to methods that have delivered numerous motorways around Australia that have not only failed to ease congestion, but have made it significantly worse.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

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

Address: 6/81 Temple St

Suburb:                            Postcode: 2044

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Crash statistics – City West Link and James St intersection. The EIS only analyses crash statistics near the interchanges. It does not provide any detail as to the number of crashes at the James St/City West Link intersection which, on Transport for NSW's own figures, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Nor does it comment on the two fatalities that occurred on Darley Road near the proposed construction site. The EIS needs to detail the increased risk in crashes that will be caused by the additional 170 vehicles a day that are proposed to enter and leave Darley Road during the construction period.

2. I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

3. The tunnels under Rozelle/Lilyfield are going to be in three levels. The EIS does not explain what safety procedures are being built into the project to deal with situations like serious congestion, accidents or fire. With a serious hold up on the deepest of these tunnels it is clear that the air quality will very quickly become toxic unless substantial air conditioning is a major part of the design. There is no in depth detail about how these issues are going to be addressed. This is not acceptable.

4. The TfNSW website says “The Sydney Metro West project is Sydney’s next big railway infrastructure investment” but the Cumulative Impact assessment by AECOM (App C) does not include West Metro. A business case for West Metro should be completed before determination of the Project.

5. Emissions were not modelled beyond 2033. This is an omission, as the contractual life of the project is significantly longer, until 2060. The EIS states, on page 22-15 that 'it is expected that savings in emissions from improved road performance would reduce over time as traffic volumes increase'. Therefore, the longer-term outcome of the project is likely to be an increase in GHG emissions.

6. Improving connectivity with public transport, including trains, light rail and bus services in the inner west would make the Parramatta Road corridor a more attractive place to live, work and socialise.

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

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

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

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

- I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents.

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

- Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat - the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.

- I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.

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

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

Name: John Doe
Signature: [Signature]

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

Please note, my details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Address: 35 King St, Newtown, NSW 2042

Suburb: Newtown
Postcode: 2042

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name: [Name]
Email: [Email]
Mobile: [Mobile]
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

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

2. No road junction as large and complex as the extraordinary spaghetti junction proposed to go underground has been built anywhere in the world. The feasibility is not tested. There are no international or national standards for such a construction.

3. The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other.

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

5. The justification for this project relies on the completion of other projects such as the Western Harbour Tunnel which has not yet been planned, let alone approved.

6. Are there other potentially serious problems with Sydney Water utility services (described at EIS 12-57) or with other utilities in other suburbs or along the proposed M4-M5 tunnel alignment? If so, the EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these are all disclosed, researched, surveyed and the resolution publicly published.

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

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

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

10. The mechanical ventilation proposed depends on single direction tunnel construction, so how it can possibly work for large curved tunnels on multiple levels is unknown.

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

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

A. I object to the whole WestConnex project but particularly this stage because the original objectives of the project — improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany — are now pushed off to another unplanned, unfunded project. The community is asked to support this proposal on the basis of several more projects, in the case of the Sydney gateway, without even a sketch of a plan.

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

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

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

E. I object particularly to the tollway going east which are unfair when people living west of Parramatta really need alternative means of travelling north-south to local neighbourhoods. If we had better public transport, eg, better train services and more buses which connect our suburbs, then many of us would not have to drive and this would reduce the traffic congestion.

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

G. Public transport is basically rejected by the EIS so the state government is forcing us to use cars more when most major cities in the world are trying to reduce the number of cars on the roads. We know this is to promote private road operators’ profits. I object to putting so much public funding to the cause of private profit.

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

I ask the Secretary of Planning to refuse approval for this project.

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

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

Name: 
Signature:  

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

Address: 
Suburb: 
Postcode: 

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

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

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

ii. The Health costs of outdoor Air Pollution in Australia are up to $8.4 Billion a year. The Health costs of Particulate Pollution in the Sydney Greater Metropolitan area is around $4.7 Billion a year. With no filtration on the Westconnex tunnels these Health costs will rise substantially.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.
- The EIS admits that drivers from lower income households are more likely to travel longer distances to avoid tolls because of the cost. Western Sydney households tend to have lower than average incomes. So we either pay the high tolls (capped at $7.95 in 2015 dollars) or drive for longer to avoid the tolls. We have seen this already where commuters decided to drive on Parramatta Rd not the new M4 with the new tolls. This is unfair.
- I object to the way this project is hailed by the Minister for Western Sydney Stuart Ayres to be for the benefit of western Sydney when hardly any parts of Sydney west of Parramatta are even mentioned in the EIS. This is misleading. All the reasons for this stage of WestConnex are about linking the new M4 and M5 to the western harbour tunnel and northern beaches tunnel. Or they talk about links to the “Sydney Gateway” to the airport and Port Botany and they are not even part of this project.
- Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1,000s more vehicles per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already traffic jams. I object to the push for the M4-M5 link when there are still no plans for the Sydney Gateway to deal with the increased traffic to the Airport or to Port Botany.
- The EIS admits that the impact of construction of the M4-M5 Link over the next 5 years will worsen traffic on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it is outrageous motorists are being asked already to pay up to up to $20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.
- The UK and European states are more and more concerned about the bad effects of car emissions on people’s health and are taking steps to tougher emission standards. Here the state government is promoting car use at the expense of public health concerns. I object to the WestConnex project because of the increased car emissions it will cause.
- Public transport is rejected by the EIS so it seems the state government is forcing us to use cars more when most major cities in the world are trying to reduce the number of cars on the roads.

The money spent on this stage could have been spent on modernizing the railway signal system so the train service could be improved which would benefit the communities west of Parramatta. What commuters out west really need is an extension of the heavy rail train system, not a new toll road. I urge the Secretary of Planning to refuse approval for this stage of WestConnex.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

I object to Stage 3 of WestConnex, the M4-M5 Link project because it will not reduce traffic, simply move it around. If the government was serious about reducing traffic in Parramatta Rd they would put a toll on it and make the new roads free to encourage the traffic to use the new roads. They are doing the exact opposite, so the tolls don’t seem to have anything to do with traffic management.

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

We know the state government intends to sell the project, both the constructing and the operation. I object to the privatization of the road system. How is the public interest in an efficient transport system to be protected when so much of road system operates to make a profit for shareholders?

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

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

The money spent on this stage could have been spent on modernizing the railway signal system so the train service could be improved which would benefit the communities west of Parramatta. What Western Sydney commuters really need is an extension of the heavy rail train system. I object because the public was never consulted or asked about their preferences.

I object to this stage of WestConnex which doesn’t benefit western Sydney in any way because it doesn’t even include the links to Port Botany or Sydney Airport which were the main justification for the whole project.

The KPMG and Ernst & Young studies cited by the EIS say NSW’s toll roads contributed $14 billion in benefits over ten years. No evidence is given. Tollways benefitted Transurban which owns most of them but that is not the same as the public interest in efficient transport, reduced vehicle emissions and reduced traffic. Now we are building more tollways to “reduce” traffic congestion, emissions etc. WestConnex is not a solution and I object to using public funds to enrich a private corporation. The project should not be approved.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: TERI ANDERSON
Signature: 

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

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

Address: 66 WATSONIA ST
Suburb: EMU PLAINS Postcode 2750

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

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

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

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

e) The mechanical ventilation proposed depends on single direction tunnel construction, so how it can possibly work for large curved tunnels on multiple levels is unknown.

f) The EIS proposes removal of all vegetation on the Darley Road site. There is a mature tree located on the site which serves as a visual and noise barrier to the heavy City West Link traffic. Removal of this tree and other vegetation will increase noise impacts to nearby residents and affect the visual amenity, with homes having a direct line of sight to the City West Link. The existing mature tree needs to be retained on this and environmental grounds.

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

Name __________________________ Email __________________________ Mobile __________________________
object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- I am concerned that while hundreds of impacts on resident, including noise, loss of business, dust, and lost time through more traffic congestion, are identified in the EIS, the approach is always to recommend approval and promise vague ‘mitigation’ in the future. This is not good enough.

- The EIS at 7-21 states that Community update Newsletters were distributed to residents ‘near the project footprint’ in many suburbs. This statement is simply not correct. No such newsletters were received by residents in central and northern Newtown. SMC was made aware of this fact, but has not responded to verbal and written requests for audited confirmation of the addresses ‘letterboxed’. This statement of community engagement should be rejected by the Department.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

a) It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

b) Crash statistics—City West Link and James St intersection. The EIS only analyses crash statistics near the interchanges. It does not provide any detail as to the number of crashes at the James St/City West Link intersection which, on Transport for NSW’s own figures, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Nor does it comment on the two fatalities that occurred on Darley Road near the proposed construction site. The EIS needs to detail the increased risk in crashes that will be caused by the additional 170 vehicles a day that are proposed to enter and leave Darley Road during the construction period.

c) The EIS states that by 2033 Ross St will see an increase of 80 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. The greatest increase of Heavy vehicles at the PM peak will be in Johnston Street, which will see an increase of about 30–50 vehicles when compared to the ‘without project’ scenario. At Catherine St there will be an increase of 30 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. These streets will see a huge increase in Heavy vehicle movements if Stage 3 is built. The increase would be roughly half this amount if the project did not go ahead. Annexure Fig 26 B2 Section H

d) The EIS shows a diagrammatic explanation of the way the polluted air will be expelled from the Westconnex tunnels. This method will work on straight tunnels of short distance providing there is no traffic congestion. There are already signs in tunnel locations in Sydney advising motorists to roll up their windows and put on their ‘in vehicle circulating’ air conditioning. This type of straight line pollution expulsion doesn’t work if the tunnels go around corners, which is the case with the tunnels from the Rozelle Rail Yards site.

e) The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

f) I am concerned that the EIS provides no reasons why the City of Sydney’s alternative plan might not be preferable to the proposed WestCONnex.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name ___________________________________________ Email ___________________________________________ Mobile ___________________________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: [Signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 34 Torres St, Kurnell

Suburb: Kurnell Postcode: 2231

- In the EIS there are indications of what is to be expected in the Rozelle Rail Yards construction site and the Crescent Civil site. But the EIS states that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed. This may result in major changes to the project design and construction methodologies. The community will have no input into this process, so the community is totally powerless to be able to comment on what will actually be proposed, how it will be carried out and what will finally be built. This is not acceptable.

- Many homes around the Rozelle Rail Yards and the Crescent Civil site will be noise affected, some will be highly noise affected. The expected duration of the cumulative works is 120 weeks, almost 3 years, when noise impact will be significant so it is essential that maximum noise mitigation measures are put in place. However the EIS contains only vague details of how mitigation will be carried out. There is no requirement that measures will in fact be carried out to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain specific noise mitigation measures, that can be mandated and enforced. Areas that will be particularly highly noise affected are Bayview Crescent and Railway Parade, the Northern end of Rail Yard site and sections of Lilyfield Rd, Hornsey St, Quirk St and Robert St. Given their proximity, receivers located along Lilyfield Rd between Victoria Road and Gordon St which overlook the Rozelle Yards are likely to experience the greatest construction noise impact within the whole Rozelle area.

- The three Pollution Stacks in the Rozelle Rail yards are shown to be 38 meters high. This is a totally inappropriate location for these Pollution Stacks. The Rozelle Rail Yards are located in a valley. The Stacks will be on land that is approximately 3.5 meters above sea level. Balmain Road between Wharf Rd and Victoria Road is at an elevation of on average 37 meters. Orange Grove Primary School is at an elevation of 33.4 meters. Areas of Hornsey Rd Rozelle are at 28 meters. Around the junction of Annandale St and Weynton St in Annandale the height above sea level is 29meters. All these areas are in close proximity to these stacks. All the pollution being exhausted from these stacks will almost be on the same level as these locations and so will be blowing almost directly into these properties, especially in summer when many windows are open. This is not acceptable. In situations of no wind the pollution will accumulate in this valley area and make the surrounding area highly polluted. This is not acceptable. There are also at least 4 schools of Primary age children well within one kilometer of these Stacks. Young children are the most vulnerable to pollution related disease.

- Permanent substation and water treatment plant – Leichhardt: I object to the location of this facility in our neighbourhood as out of step with the surroundings. If it is retained, then it should be moved to the north of the site, out of view from homes. The residual land should be returned for community purposes such as parkland.

- I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Name ___________________ Email ___________________ Mobile ___________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- I note that in the area of Lilyfield Rd and Gordon Street, the work proposed which would include deep excavation that would result in major adverse impacts on archaeological remains, while other surface works would have localised impacts on archaeological remains that may be present. It is suggested that what are called ‘management measures’ would be carried out including the development of a Historical Archaeological Research Design which would include an “assessment of any detailed design plans to develop a methodology and scope for a program of test excavation to determine the nature, condition and extent of potential archaeological remains.” This is completely unacceptable to me. The community will have no right to any input into this plan or access to independent expert advice. This is all part of an ‘approve now’, ‘research later’ approach that will lead to poorly planned unnecessary destruction, a loss of potential community history and understanding.

- It is quite clear to me that insufficient research has been done on the archeology of the Rozelle Railway yards. This could be a valuable archeology site. Why has an EIS been put forward without the necessary research being done to further identify potential remains? No project should be approved on the basis of such an inadequate level of research.

- The EIS admits that it is not even known what excavation would be undertaken at the White Bay Power station. I am particularly concerned about the old water channels and the southern penstock which are part of Sydney’s industrial heritage. How could an EIS for such a major project be put forward on this basis? It is fatuous to state that “physical and indirect impacts on this heritage element should be avoided” and suggest that a future plan should be done. Why isn’t the need for excavation known? This raises great concerns about the “indicative only” nature of the work that has been done before this EIS. Why is there such a rush? This EIS is not complete and should be rejected for that reason.

- The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction. (Executive Summary xviii)

**Campaign Mailing Lists**: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties
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**Attention Director**

Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- The EIS social and economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestCONnex has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.

- The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.

- The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.

- I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.

- The EIS acknowledges that impacts of construction should M4M5 get approval will worsen traffic congestions on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it would be outrageous for motorists to be asked to pay up to up to $20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.

- Streets in Haberfield would be subject to heavy vehicle traffic for a further four years, making at least 7 years of heavy impacts on a single suburb. The answer is not a "community strategy". Residents who believed that their pain would be over after the M4 east are now being asked to sustain a further four years of impacts. No compensation or serious mitigation is suggested.

- The EIS acknowledges that four years of M4/M5 construction would have a negative economic and social impact across the Inner West through interrupted traffic routes, slower traffic times, disruption with public transport, interruption with businesses and loss of connections across communities. This finding highlights the need for a proper cost benefit analysis for the project. Such social costs should not simply be dismissed with the promise of a construction plan into which the community has not input or powers to enforce.

- I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Name __________________________ Email __________________________ Mobile __________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

1. I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

2. Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.

3. It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.

4. The substation and water treatment plant should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link. This will mean that the site is less visible to residents and most pedestrian access is at this end. There are no homes that will have direct line of site of the facility if it is moved. This will also enable direct pedestrian access to the light rail without the need to use the winding path at the rear of the site which creates safety issues and adds to the time required to access the light rail stop.

5. The warm and caring words contained in the EIS, ref Sustainability Management Strategy, have not been reflected in the wanton destruction of homes, trees and habitat already. Why should we believe them?

6. I am concerned that while the EIS finds that tolls do weigh more heavily on lower income motorists, there is no serious analysis of the blatant unfairness of letting of private consortium toll people for decades in order to pay for less profitable tollways for wealthier communities.

7. We object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that it provides for daily movements of 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road. This creates an unacceptable risk to the safety of pedestrians accessing the North Leichhardt light rail stop as well as bicycle users accessing the bicycle route on Darley Road and entering Canal road to join the dedicated bike paths on the bay run. Many school children cross at this point to walk to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College. The EIS states that an alternative truck movement is proposed which involves use of the City West Link with no trucks to access Darley Road. The selection of Darley Road should not be approved if it involves any truck movements on Darley Road, which is what it currently provides.
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- There will be 5 entrances/exits to the Rozelle Yards site off Lilyfield Road for light vehicles and 2 entrances/exits for Heavy vehicles off the City West Link. The 2 entrances on the City West Link, one opposite the exit of the Crescent and one 400 metres further West on the City West Link will have to have traffic controls set up to allow trucks to access and exit. This will lead to a big increase in congestion in this area, the main route to Anzac Bridge and Victoria Rd.

- There are two areas in the Rozelle Rail Yards site where construction will be by cut and cover. These are the Portals for the Western Harbour Tunnel and the Portals for the M4/M5 link. This is of particular concern in the light of residents experiences in areas of Haberfield and St Peters where highly contaminated land areas were being disturbed. There was totally inadequate control of dust in these areas, where the dust would have been loaded with toxic chemical particulates. The old Rail Yards are highly contaminated land from their past use. The EIS gives no specific details of how this highly toxic threat is going to be securely managed. It is not acceptable for this to be decided only when the Construction Contracts have been issued, when the community will have no say or control over the methodology to be employed for removing vast amounts of contaminated spoil.

- Land Subsidence in the areas of all tunnel routes is of great concern to all residents. This is of special concern in the Rozelle/Lilyfield area where there are layers of tunnels. There is likely to be ongoing and considerable subsidence even when the tunnels are built due to the ongoing necessity to remove ground water from the tunnels. This will lead to a slow drying out of the sandstone and hence settlement.

- Recently Andrew Constance has been quoted numerous times promoting his vision of the transport future and some of these views are aired in the EIS but the vision put forward is highly visionary with no practical detail addressing how these changes are going to be brought about and so they are totally unrealistic. For example it is starting to be commonly accepted that car manufacturers will be reducing production of petrol/diesel cars before 2040 probably starting in 2030. It is proposed that electric cars will then take over. It is suggested that cars will be charged over night at people's homes. Virtually no one in the Inner City Suburbs has a garage. Are all the streets throughout the City going to be fitted out with charging points outside all the houses, similar to parking meters? We have all watched the shambles of the rolling out of the NBN it would be mind blowing to watch what would happen with the rolling out of charging points to each household without a garage and it would take years to achieve. There are virtually no recharging points at any Fuel Stations anywhere as yet and to set these up will take years. A large part of the population run older cars, because that is all they are able to afford. It will take many years for these petrol/diesel cars to disappear. Andrew Constance has also said that when everyone is driving an autonomous car average speeds will be reduced but as they are not being controlled by individual drivers this will mean they will be able to travel much closer together and so there will not be so much delay caused by spread out congestion. If this is to be so perhaps the suggestion could be made that some mechanism could be employed which would enable these cars to link together; if that could be done then they could form -a TRAIN- and then really travel at speed!

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Name _____________________________ Email _____________________________ Mobile _____________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Molly Forgel
Signature:..............................

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address:.............................................Postcode: 2043

Submission to:
Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Application Number: SSI 7485
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

a) EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states, “..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval”. It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a “review(ed) for consistency”, and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant ‘uncertainties’ have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie: the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)

b) The consultants for the Social and Economic Impact study is HillPDA. This company has a conflict of interest and is not an appropriate choice to do a social impact study of WestCONnex. Amongst its services it offers property valuation services and promotes property development in what are perceived to be strategic locations. HillPDA were heavily involved in work leading to the development of Urban Growth NSW and the heavily criticised Parramatta Rd Study. It is not in the public interest to use public funds on an EIS done by a company that has such a heavy stake in property development opportunities along the Parramatta Rd corridor. One of the advantages of property development along Parramatta Rd that Hill PDA promotes on its website is the 33 kilometre WestCONnex.

c) There have been widespread reports in the media about extensive unresolved disputes regarding damages to houses in the Stage 1 M4 and Stage 2 M5 construction process. Why should the community believe that there will not be extensive damages to houses in Stage 3?

d) In Leichhardt serious safety concerns about the choice of the Darley Rd site have been raised by the Inner West Council and an independent engineer's report. Despite countless meetings between local residents and SMC and RMS over 12 months, none of the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents have even been acknowledged. This is a massive breach of community trust and seriously questions the integrity of the EIS.

e) The EIS states that an alternative truck movement is proposed which involves use of the City West Link and no need for spoil trucks to access Darley Road. This proposal is supported, subject to further information about potential impacts being provided. The EIS should not be approved on its current basis which provides for 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road on a daily basis. This will create unacceptable safety issues and noise impacts for adjacent homes while also compromising pedestrian and bicycle access to the light rail and bay run. It will also lead to truck chaos on this critical arterial road providing access to and across the City west Link. The current proposal which provides for truck movements solely on Darley Road should not be approved and approval should only be given to the alternative proposal. I repeat however my objection to the selection of this site altogether, but propose the least worst impact should be chosen if this site is to be used.

f) The justification for this project relies on the completion of other projects such as the Western Harbour Tunnel which has not yet been planned, let alone approved.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name........................................ Email........................................ Mobile........................................
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Matthew Faber
Signature: [Signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.

Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 157a George Street
Suburb: Erskineville
Postcode: 2043

Submission to:
Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director—Transport Assessments
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

a) The social and economic impact study fails to record the great concern for valued Newtown heritage.

b) I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.

c) Insufficient time has been given for the community to prepare submissions to the EIS, especially when one considers that whole neighbourhoods affected by the project were not even notified during the concept design period. e.g. Newtown, east of King St.

d) The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other. The increasing numbers of vehicles will also increase the vehicle pollution (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic) in this area.

e) The mechanical ventilation proposed depends on single direction tunnel construction, so how it can possibly work for large curved tunnels on multiple levels is unknown.

f) The EIS proposes removal of all vegetation on the Darley Road site. There is a mature tree located on the site which serves as a visual and noise barrier to the heavy City West Link traffic. Removal of this tree and other vegetation will increase noise impacts to nearby residents and affect the visual amenity, with homes having a direct line of sight to the City West Link. The existing mature tree needs to be retained on this and environmental grounds.

g) The EIS needs to provide specific detail as to what will be provided by way of alternative accommodation to the 36 residents identified as suffering extreme noise interference. There is no plan to temporarily relocate such residents, not to offer them financial compensation to enable them to move out during the worst period. There is an estimated 10 weeks of extreme noise during demolition of the commercial building and preparatory road works. Once this work is finished the residents will also be forced to endure a truck every 304 minutes for a period of five years. It is clearly not possible for such residents to continue to live in these houses and the EIS needs to detail what will be provided in terms of alternative living arrangements for part, or all of the construction work period.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Name ___________________________ Email ___________________________ Mobile ___________________________
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used. The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective.

2. The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction. (Executive Summary xviii)

3. The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the site which includes a mature tree. I object to the removal of the tree which creates a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the tree is removed it must be replaced with a mature tree as soon as the remediation of the site commences.

4. Hundreds of risks associated with this project have not been assessed but have instead been deferred to a detailed design stage into which the public will have no input. I call on the Department of Planning to reject this inadequate EIS that has been prepared by AECOM that has multiple commercial interests in WestConnex.

5. The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street will greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased by the time Stage 3 is completed. It states that Stage 3 will do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at Peak times. This will be highly negative for the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through the local areas on local streets.

6. Acquisition of Dan Murphys – I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the tax payer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances.

7. Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name ___________________________ Email ___________________________ Mobile ___________________________
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- I note that in the area of Lilyfield Rd and Gordon Street, the work proposed which would include deep excavation that would result in major adverse impacts on archaeological remains, while other surface works would have localised impacts on archaeological remains that may be present. It is suggested that what are called ‘management measures’ would be carried out including the development of a Historical Archaeological Research Design which would include an “assessment of any detailed design plans to develop a methodology and scope for a program of test excavation to determine the nature, condition and extent of potential archaeological remains.” This is completely unacceptable to me. The community will have no right to any input into this plan or access to independent expert advice. This is all part of an ‘approve now’, ‘research later’ approach that will lead to poorly planned unnecessary destruction, a loss of potential community history and understanding.

- It is quite clear to me that insufficient research has been done on the archeology of the Rozelle Railway yards. This could be a valuable archeology site. Why has an EIS been put forward without the necessary research being done to further identify potential remains? No project should be approved on the basis of such an inadequate level of research.

- The EIS admits that it is not even known what excavation would be undertaken at the White Bay Power station. I am particularly concerned about the old water channels and the southern penstock which are part of Sydney’s industrial heritage. How could an EIS for such a major project be put forward on this basis? It is fatuous to state that "physical and indirect impacts on this heritage element should be avoided" and suggest that a future plan should be done. Why isn’t the need for excavation known? This raises great concerns about the ‘indicative only’ nature of the work that has been done before this EIS. Why is there such a rush? This EIS is not complete and should be rejected for that reason.

- The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction. (Executive Summary xviii)
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.

- We know the state government intends to sell the project, both the constructing and the operation. I object to the privatization of the road system. There is no guarantee of protecting the public interest in an efficient transport system when so much of it operates to make a profit for shareholders.

- The high tolls are set to increase by the CPI or by 4% a year, whichever is higher. When inflation is low and wages are not even keeping up with low inflation this is outrageous. This is just gouging western Sydney road users to make the road attractive to a buyer.

- I object to the high tolls imposed on drivers who have no decent alternative in public transport if they live further west than Parramatta. It is outrageous that the EIS quotes from studies in favour of tollways done by the big accounting firms, KPMG and Ernst and Young, and paid for by Transurban, which owns more tollways in Australia than any other corporation. How can this be unbiased?

- The EIS admits that the people who live in western Sydney have lower household incomes than in the inner suburbs and that the tolls will therefore be a heavier cost in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, Blacktown or Wetherill Park than in Strathfield or Padstow. This is unfair when the benefits of Stage 3 are all for north-south connections to the northern beaches or the proposed new harbour tunnel.

- Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

- The money spent on Stages 2 and 3 could have been spent on modernizing the railway signal system so the train service could be improved which would benefit the communities west of Parramatta. What commuters out west really need is an extension of the heavy rail train system. I object that we were never given a choice about it.

- Public transport is rejected by the EIS so the state government is forcing us to use cars more when most major cities in the world are trying to reduce the number of cars on the roads. We know this is to promote private road operators' profits. I object to putting so much public funding to the cause of private profit.

I urge the Secretary of Planning to refuse approval of this project.

---

**Campaign Mailing Lists:** I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Name ___________________________ Email ___________________________ Mobile ___________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Matthew Capp

Signature: [Signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 34 Queen St, Newtown NSW 2042

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

In the EIS there are indications of what is to be expected in the Rozelle Rail Yards construction site and the Crescent Civil site. But the EIS states that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed. This may result in major changes to the project design and construction methodologies. The community will have no input into this process, so the community is totally powerless to be able to comment on what will actually be proposed, how it will be carried out and what will finally be built. This is not acceptable.

Many homes around the Rozelle Rail Yards and the Crescent Civil site will be noise affected, some will be highly noise affected. The expected duration of the cumulative works is 120 weeks, almost 3 years, when noise impact will be significant so it is essential that maximum noise mitigation measures are put in place. However the EIS contains only vague details of how mitigation will be carried out. There is no requirement that measures will in fact be carried out to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain specific noise mitigation measures, that can be mandated and enforced. Areas that will be particularly highly noise affected are Bayview Crescent and Railway Parade, the Northern end of Rail Yard site and sections of Lilyfield Rd, Hornsey St, Quirk St and Robert St. Given their proximity, receivers located along Lilyfield Rd between Victoria Road and Gordon St which overlook the Rozelle Yards are likely to experience the greatest construction noise impact within the whole Rozelle area.

The three Pollution Stacks in the Rozelle Rail yards are shown to be 38 meters high. This is a totally inappropriate location for these Pollution Stacks. The Rozelle Rail Yards are located in a valley. The Stacks will be on land that is approximately 3.5 meters above sea level. Balmain Road between Wharf Rd and Victoria Road is at an elevation of on average 37 meters. Orange Grove Primary School is at an elevation of 33.4 meters. Areas of Hornsey Rd Rozelle are at 28 meters. Around the junction of Annandale St and Weynton St in Annandale the height above sea level is 29 meters. All these areas are in close proximity to these stacks. All the pollution being exhausted from these stacks will almost be on the same level as these locations and so will be blowing almost directly into these properties, especially in summer when many windows are open. This is not acceptable. In situations of no wind the pollution will accumulate in this valley area and make the surrounding area highly polluted. This is not acceptable. There are also at least 4 schools of Primary age children well within one kilometer of these Stacks. Young children are the most vulnerable to pollution related disease.

Permanent substation and water treatment plant – Leichhardt: I object to the location of this facility in our neighbourhood as out of step with the surroundings. If it is retained, then it should be moved to the north of the site, out of view from homes. The residual land should be returned for community purposes such as parkland.

I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Name_________________ Email_________________ Mobile_________________
Attention Director  
Application Number: SSI 7485  
Infrastrace Projects, Planning Services,  
Department of Planning and Environment  
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

I. The tunnels under Rozelle/Lilyfield are going to be in three levels. The EIS does not explain what safety procedures are being built into the project to deal with situations like serious congestion, accidents or fire. With a serious hold up on the deepest of these tunnels it is clear that the air quality will very quickly become toxic unless substantial air conditioning is a major part of the design. There is no in depth detail about how these issues are going to be addressed. This is not acceptable.

II. Additional facilities. The EIS states that the contractor may decide upon additional ‘construction ancillary facilities’ to the 12 identified in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be more unidentified sites taken, as residents will have no opportunity to comment on their impacts. The approval condition should limit any construction facilities to those already notified and detailed in the EIS.

III. I am concerned that while hundreds of impacts on resident, including noise, loss of business, dust, and lost time through more traffic congestion, are identified in the EIS, the approach is always to recommend approval and promise vague ‘mitigation’ in the future. This is not good enough.

IV. The EIS at 7-21 states that Community update Newsletters were distributed to residents ‘near the project footprint’ in many suburbs. This statement is simply not correct. No such newsletters were received by residents in central and northern Newtown. SMC was made aware of this fact, but has not responded to verbal and written requests for audited confirmation of the addresses ‘letterboxed’. This statement of community engagement should be rejected by the Department.

V. The EIS uses the term ‘construction fatigue’ to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality ‘construction fatigue’ means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of ‘construction fatigue’. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.

VI. The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

VII. It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Michelle Brown

Signature: 

Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Attn: Director - Transport Assessments
Application Number: SSI 7485
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Address: 10 Joshua Street

Suburb: Goulburn
Postcode 2580

A. The EIS lacks sufficient focus on traffic congestion in the suburbs of Alexandria and Erskineville. Are these being ignored because they will be even more congested than currently.

B. The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed. All possible mitigation should be included as a condition of approval. The EIS acknowledges that substantial above ground invasive works will be required to demolish the Dan Murphys building and establish the road. The EIS noise projections indicate that for 10 weeks residents will suffer unacceptable noise impacts. The EIS does not contain a plan to manage or mitigate this terrible impact. There is no detail as to which homes will be offered (if at all) temporary relocation; there are no details of any noise walls or what treatments will be provided to individual homes that are badly affected. The approval needs to contain detail as to how this unacceptable impact will be managed and minimised during the construction period and, in particular, during site establishment.

C. I object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that the works required (demolition and surface works) will create unacceptable and unbearable noise and vibration impacts for extended periods. The EIS indicates that at least 36 homes will basically be unliveable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.

D. I am concerned that the EIS provides no reasons why the City of Sydney’s alternative plan might not be preferable to the proposed WestCONnex.

E. The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.

F. An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow ‘swoosh’ that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be ‘encouraged’ to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that ‘definitive’ rather than ‘indicative’ alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair ‘definitive’ document open for genuine public comment.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Name Email Mobile
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

I. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement may occur. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The EIS states that ‘settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment’. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres. This proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. In addition, the EIS states that there are a number of discrete areas to the north and northwest of the Rozelle Rail Yards, to the north of Campbell Road at St Peters and in the vicinity of Lord Street at Newtown where ground water movement above 20 milliliters is predicted ‘strict limits on the degree of settlement permitted would be imposed on the project’ and ‘damage’ would be rectified at no cost to the owner. would be placed (Executive Summary, xvii -iii). The project should not be permitted to be delivered in such a way that there is a known risk to property damage that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level of risk.

II. The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. It relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the “detailed design” phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.

III. Where is the commitment to community consultation and to long term planning when the EIS for the M4/M5 Link is released before any response to the extensive community feedback on the M4-M5 Link concept design could possibly have been seriously considered. This demonstrates deep government contempt for the people of NSW and the communities of the Inner West of Sydney in particular.

IV. Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. There must be a review of the NSW government's unacceptable policy on this issue. I am appalled that the ex Minister for Planning Rob Stokes who approved the New M5 and unfiltered stacks in St Peters and Haberfield would declare that he would not have them in his own area. How can residents have any trust in a process that is underpinned by such hypocrisy.

V. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters Interchange will have a heavy disruptive impact on the local transport routes, whether by vehicle, bus, or active transport (walking and cycling).
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

i. I specifically object to the removal of the lighting tower and the Port Authority Building. These items are of considerable local significance and are representative of the operation of the Rozelle Rail Yards in the first part of the 20th century. I do not agree with trashing industrial history when it could be put to good community use.

ii. Noise impacts - Camperdown The EIS indicates that a large number of residents will be affected by construction noise caused by demolition and pavement and infrastructure works. This includes use of a rock breaker and concrete saw. During all periods of construction, there will be noise impacts from construction of site car parking and deliveries and pavement and infrastructure works. No proper mitigation measures are proposed to protect residents from these impacts (10-119, EIS) The EIS admits that three residents and two businesses will be subject to noise impacts above acceptable levels for 76 days (10-119, EIS) No detail is provided as to whether alternative accommodation will be offered or other compensation.

iii. Easton Park has a long history and is part of an urban environment which is unusual in Sydney. The park needs to be assessed from a visual design point of view. It will be quite a different park when its view is changed to one of a large ventilation stack. The suggestion that it has been 'saved' needs to be considered in the light of the severe 5 years construction impacts and the reshaped urban environment.

iv. Cumulative construction impacts - Camperdown. The EIS states that residents will likely be subject to cumulative construction impacts as several tunnelling works activities may operate simultaneously (10-119, EIS) No mitigation steps are proposed to ease this impact on those affected.

v. I oppose the removal of further homes of Significance in either Haberfield or Ashfield. The level of destruction has already been appalling. Residents were led to expect that there would be no further construction impacts after the completion of the M4 East. The loss of further houses of the community will cause further distress within this community.

vi. Ground-borne out-of-hours work - Camperdown The EIS acknowledges the noise and vibration impacts and the need for work to occur outside of standard daytime construction hours. It simply states that 'the specific management strategy for addressing potential impacts associated with ground-borne noise...would be documented in the OOHW protocol. This is inadequate as the community have no opportunity to comment on the OOHW protocol or the management of the ongoing impacts to which they will be subjected.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name __________________________ Email ____________ Mobile ____________
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

I. The EIS does not provide appropriate parking for the estimated 100 or so workers that the EIS states will work every day at the site, while other equivalent sites have allocated parking for such workers (Northcote Civil site (150)) and Parramatta Road East Civil site (140). It is also noted that the EIS provides for loss of 20 residential parks on Darley Road. Local streets are at capacity already because of the lack of off-street parking for many residents and the Light Rail stop which means that commuters use local streets. The EIS states that workers `will be encouraged to use public transport.' the EIS needs to mandate that no trucks or construction vehicles are to park in local streets. There needs to be a requirement that is enforceable that workers use the Light Rail stop which is adjacent to the site or a plan to bus in workers.

II. The EIS does not require an acoustic shed and states that `Acoustic barriers and devices at the access tunnel entrances would be considered and implemented where reasonable and feasible to minimise potential noise impacts associated with out-of-hours works within the tunnels.'

III. The EIS contains no detail of the access tunnel from the Darley Road site to the mainline tunnel other than depicting the route. The approval conditions need to ensure that tunnelling is occurring at sufficient depth so as to not jeopardise the integrity of the homes and not create unacceptable vibration and noise impacts for James Street residents and those at adjacent streets. The approval conditions need to make clear the period of time for which the ‘temporary’ tunnel is to be used.

IV. The EIS states that ‘a preferred noise mitigation option’ would be determined during ‘detailed design’. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)

V. The EIS social an economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestCONnex has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.

VI. Light construction vehicle routes – the EIS acknowledges that these vehicles will use ‘dispersed’ routes (8-62). In other words, construction vehicles will use and park on local roads. The EIS does not propose any management as to which roads they use. The addition of 70-100 light vehicle movements day in Leichhardt will result in our small, congested streets, which are already at capacity and suffering parking shortages, will have the added impact of workers travelling to and from the site and parking in local streets. There will be rat running. The EIS should provide an agreed route (using arterial roads only) that can be used by all vehicles associated with the project.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name ___________________________ Email ___________________________ Mobile ___________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

I. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

II. The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.

III. Flooding – Leichhardt. Darley Road and adjacent streets such as Hubert St are exposed to flood. The flood impact could be exacerbated by the disruption or blockage of existing drainage networks, which are risks identified in the EIS. The EIS has not assessed whether the identified risk to the existing drainage network will cause increased risk of flood damage to flood lots and it fails to take account of the Inner West Council’s Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan which contains recommended flood modification options. The EIS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede the Inner West Council’s Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM3 to lay additional pipes/culverts from Elswick Street to Hawthorne Canal (via Regent Street and Darley Road). RMS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede Inner West Council’s Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM4 to lay additional pipes/ culverts from William Street to Hawthorne Canal via Hubert Street and Darley Road. The EIS should not be approved as it has not properly explained or assessed these impacts.

IV. Discharge of water into storm water at Blackmore Oval – Leichhardt. The permanent substation and water treatment plant proposed for the Darley Road site facility should not be approved as part of the EIS. It proposes discharging water from the tunnels into the storm water canal near Blackmore Oval. This will devastate our waterways and impact negatively on the amenity of the bay which has four rowing clubs in close proximity. In addition, the environmental impacts of this discharge are not properly set out in the EIS.

V. Are there other potentially serious problems with Sydney Water utility services (described at EIS 12-57) or with other utilities in other suburbs or along the proposed M4-M5 tunnel alignment? If so, the EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these are all disclosed, researched, surveyed and the resolution publicly published.
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

i. The site should be returned to the community as compensation for the imposition of this construction site in our neighbourhood for a 5 year period. If the substations and water treatment plant is moved to the north of the site, then the lower half of the site (which is the most accessible end) could be converted into open space with mature trees planted. As this site is immediately adjacent to the bay run, bicycle parking and other facilities that support active transport could be included. This would result in the green space for residents and result in a pleasant green environment for pedestrians, rather than a fenced facility.

ii. Why the so called ‘King Street Gateway’ been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects?

iii. I am concerned that the AECOM, the company responsible for the EIS, always approve knocking down heritage buildings if the project requires it. It doesn't how much value it holds for the community, it must always be destroyed.

iv. No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents to not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of ‘kiss and ride facilities’ at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.

v. The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.

vi. I oppose the destruction of any more of Sydney's heritage for WestCONnex. I am appalled that Sydney Motorway Corporation is seeking approval to tunnel under hundreds of highly valued heritage buildings in Newtown without any serious assessment of risk at all. This heritage belongs to all of Sydney.

vii. A lot of work has gone into building cycling and pedestrian routes in Rozelle and Annandale. Interference and disruption of routes for four years is not a ‘temporary’ imposition.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Name __________________________ Email __________________________ Mobile __________________________
Attention Director  
Application Number: SSI 7485

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

1) I note that in the area of Lilyfield Rd and Gordon Street, the work proposed which would include deep excavation that would result in major adverse impacts on archaeological remains, while other surface works would have localised impacts on archaeological remains that may be present. It is suggested that what are called ‘management measures’ would be carried out including the development of a Historical Archaeological Research Design which would include an “assessment of any detailed design plans to develop a methodology and scope for a program of test excavation to determine the nature, condition and extent of potential archaeological remains.” This is completely unacceptable to me. The community will have no right to any input into this plan or access to independent expert advice. This is all part of an ‘approve now’, ‘research later’ approach that will lead to poorly planned unnecessary destruction, a loss of potential community history and understanding.

2) It is quite clear to me that insufficient research has been done on the archeology of the Rozelle Railway yards. This could be a valuable archeology site. Why has an EIS been put forward without the necessary research being done to further identify potential remains? No project should be approved on the basis of such an inadequate level of research.

3) The EIS admits that it is not even known what excavation would be undertaken at the White Bay Power station. I am particularly concerned about the old water channels and the southern penstock which are part of Sydney’s industrial heritage. How could an EIS for such a major project be put forward on this basis? It is facetious to state that ”physical and indirect impacts on this heritage element should be avoided” and suggest that a future plan should be done. Why isn’t the need for excavation known? This raises great concerns about the ‘indicative only’ nature of the work that has been done before this EIS. Why is there such a rush? This EIS is not complete and should be rejected for that reason.

4) The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction. (Executive Summary xviii)

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name: ___________________ Email: ___________________.

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: Kotara Place

Suburb: Miranda Postcode: 2228

Signature: ___________________

Name: Abe Bianchfod
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

1) I note that in the area of Lilyfield Rd and Gordon Street, the work proposed which would include deep excavation that would result in major adverse impacts on archaeological remains, while other surface works would have localised impacts on archaeological remains that may be present. It is suggested that what are called ‘management measures’ would be carried out including the development of a Historical Archaeological Research Design which would include an “assessment of any detailed design plans to develop a methodology and scope for a program of test excavation to determine the nature, condition and extent of potential archaeological remains.” This is completely unacceptable to me. The community will have no right to any input into this plan or access to independent expert advice. This is all part of an ‘approve now’, ‘research later’ approach that will lead to poorly planned unnecessary destruction, a loss of potential community history and understanding.

2) It is quite clear to me that insufficient research has been done on the archeology of the Rozelle Railway yards. This could be a valuable archeology site. Why has an EIS been put forward without the necessary research being done to further identify potential remains? No project should be approved on the basis of such an inadequate level of research.

3) The EIS admits that it is not even known what excavation would be undertaken at the White Bay Power station. I am particularly concerned about the old water channels and the southern penstock which are part of Sydney’s industrial heritage. How could an EIS for such a major project be put forward on this basis? It is fatuous to state that “physical and indirect impacts on this heritage element should be avoided” and suggest that a future plan should be done. Why isn’t the need for excavation known? This raises great concerns about the ‘indicative only’ nature of the work that has been done before this EIS. Why is there such a rush? This EIS is not complete and should be rejected for that reason.

4) The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction. (Executive Summary xviii)
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

I. Permanent water treatment plant and substation - Leichhardt. The proposal to locate this permanent structure in a residential setting is opposed. The site will have a negative visual impact on the area and is in direct line of sight of a number of homes. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site further from homes.

II. The assessment and solution to potentially serious problems described in the EIS at 12-57 (where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs) is "based on assumptions about the strength and stiffness of the water tunnels given that limited information about the design and condition of these assets was available. Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water assets. A detailed assessment would be carried out in consultation with Sydney Water to demonstrate that construction of the M4-M5 Link tunnels would have negligible adverse settlement or vibration impacts on these tunnels. A settlement monitoring program would also be implemented during construction to validate or reassess the predictions should it be required." The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.

III. The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.

IV. Because this is still based on a "concept design" it is unknown how the communities affected will not know what is being done below their residences, schools, business premises and public spaces, particularly if the whole project is sold into a private corporation's ownership before the actual designs and construction plans are determined. The EIS makes references to these designs and plans being reviewed but there is NO information as to what agency will be responsible for such reviews or whether the outcomes of such reviews will be made public. The communities below whose homes, business premises, public buildings and public spaces this massive project will be excavated and built will be completely in the dark about what is being done, what standards it is supposed to comply with, what inspection or scrutiny it will subject to, and whether the private corporations undertaking the work will be held to any liability by our government.

V. The EIS uses maps indicating alignment of the mainline tunnels. It is clear from more detailed reading deep into the EIS (ie 12-57 Sydney Water Tunnels) that the alignment and depths of the tunnels may vary very significantly, after further survey work has been done and construction methodology determined by the construction contractor. The maps provided in the EIS are nothing more than 'indicative' and are misleading the community. The EIS should be withdrawn, corrected and updated, and reissued for genuine public comment based on 'definitive' information.

I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application
# SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Danielle Morgan

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 80 Browns Lane

Suburb: New Town Postcode 2042

I. (6-51) The EIS needs to mandate that these measures are in place. Where mentioned, the acoustic shed that is considered offers the lower grade noise protection. This is despite the fact that 36 'sensitive receivers' are identified in the EIS, who will have extreme noise disturbance through much of the 5-year construction period. In addition, the acoustic shed covers only the spoil and spoil handling area and not the tunnel entrances and exits. The highest level of noise protection, which is only suggested in the EIS, needs to be mandated in the EIS. In addition, the shed needs to cover both the entrance and exit to the site and not simply the spoil handling areas. The independent engineer's report (commissioned by the Inner West council) states that it is likely, because of the elevated position of the site, that it is likely an acoustic shed will not contain the noise to an acceptable level. In addition, a temporary access tunnel will be built from the top of the site and run directly under homes in James Street. These homes will be unacceptably impacted by the construction noise and truck movements without these additional measures.

II. I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.

III. The EIS states that these will occur near the Darley Road site. There is no detail provided, nor is there a process by which residents can influence such decisions. The Inner West Council's documents state that Darley Road is not built to normal road requirements and safety standards, as it was established as an access road for the former goods line. Two fatalities have occurred near the site location, with many accidents. The Council has been trying to make Darley Road a safer route for many years. Elwick Street North for example was partially closed as a result of a fatality. The approval conditions need to make it clear that all road closures need to be made in consultation with residents affected and that the safety issues are adequately addressed. No arterial traffic from Darley Road should be allowed to be diverted onto narrow local roads.

IV. The proposed work hours for the Rozelle Rail Yards are tunnelling and spoil handling 24 hours a day seven days a week. Civil construction Mon - Fri 7.00am - 6.00pm, Sat 8.00am -1.00 pm. There will be no night work at The Crescent Civil Site and the daytime hours are stated to be the same as at the Rozelle Rail Yards. However as has been experienced by those at Haberfield and St Peters these hours and especially late and night work have been extended and implemented when the schedule has fallen behind and this has lead to physical and mental stress for many residents through interrupted sleep and loss of sleep especially with children. The roads and sites at night in the area will see a marked increase in noise from truck movements, truck reversing alarms and running machinery. It will also see a marked increase in light during the night hours with site illumination and vehicle head lights as has been experienced in other areas. These problems have not been properly addressed and are not adequately dealt with in the EIS.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Name ___________________ Email ___________________ Mobile ___________________
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

i. Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downplays concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. The raises the question of whether this is a result of the failure of SMC to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters about the potential impacts of the M4 M5

ii. The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.

iii. I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.

iv. I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.

v. The EIS acknowledges that extra construction traffic will add to travel times across the Inner West and have a negative impact on businesses in the area. No compensation is suggested. These impacts are not been taken into account of evaluating the cost of WestCONNex.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name ___________________________ Email ___________________________ Mobile ___________________________
I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

i. I specifically object to the removal of the lighting tower and the Port Authority Building. These items are of considerable local significance and are representative of the operation of the Rozelle Rail Yards in the first part of the 20th century. I do not agree with trashing industrial history when it could be put to good community use.

ii. Noise impacts - Camperdown. The EIS indicates that a large number of residents will be affected by construction noise caused by demolition and pavement and infrastructure works. This includes use of a rock breaker and concrete saw. During all periods of construction, there will be noise impacts from construction of site car parking and deliveries and pavement and infrastructure works. No proper mitigation measures are proposed to protect residents from these impacts (10–118, EIS) The EIS admits that three residents and two businesses will be subject to noise impacts above acceptable levels for 16 days (10–119, EIS) No detail is provided as to whether alternative accommodation will be offered or other compensation.

iii. Easton Park has a long history and is part of an urban environment which is unusual in Sydney. The park needs to be assessed from a visual design point of view. It will be quite a different park when its view is changed to one of a large ventilation stack. The suggestion that it has been ‘saved’ needs to be considered in the light of the severe 5 years construction impacts and the reshaped urban environment.

iv. Cumulative construction impacts - Camperdown. The EIS states that residents will likely be subject to cumulative construction impacts as several tunnelling works activities may operate simultaneously (10–119, EIS) No mitigation steps are proposed to ease this impact on those affected.

v. I oppose the removal of further homes of Significance in either Haberfield or Ashfield. The level of destruction has already been appalling. Residents were led to expect that there would be no further construction impacts after the completion of the M4 East. The loss of further houses of the community will cause further distress within this community.

vi. Ground-borne out-of-hours work - Camperdown. The EIS acknowledges the noise and vibration impacts and the need for work to occur outside of standard daytime construction hours. It simply states that ‘the specific management strategy for addressing potential impacts associated with ground-borne noise...would be documented in the OOHW protocol. This is inadequate as the community have no opportunity to comment on the OOHW protocol or the management of the ongoing impacts to which they will be subjected.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Danielle Morgan

Signature: 

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 80 Brough Lane

Suburb: Newtown

Postcode: 2042

Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

II. The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.

III. Flooding - Leichhardt. Darley Road and adjacent streets such as Hubert St are exposed to flood. The flood impact could be exacerbated by the disruption or blockage of existing drainage networks, which are risks identified in the EIS. The EIS has not assessed whether the identified risk to the existing drainage network will cause increased risk of flood damage to flood lots and it fails to take account of the Inner West Council’s Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan which contains recommended flood modification options. The EIS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede the Inner West Council’s Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM3 to lay additional pipes/culverts from Elswick Street to Hawthorne Canal (via Regent Street and Darley Road). RMS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede Inner West Council’s Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM4 to lay additional pipes/ culverts from William Street to Hawthorne Canal via Hubert Street and Darley Road. The EIS should not be approved as it has not properly explained or assessed these impacts.

IV. Discharge of water into storm water at Blackmore Oval - Leichhardt The permanent substation and water treatment plant proposed for the Darley Road site facility should not be approved as part of the EIS. It proposes discharging water from the tunnels into the storm water canal near Blackmore Oval. This will devastate our waterways and impact negatively on the amenity of the bay which has four rowing clubs in close proximity. In addition, the environmental impacts of this discharge are not properly explained or assessed these impacts.

V. Are there other potentially serious problems with Sydney Water utility services (described at EIS 12-57) or with other utilities in other suburbs or along the proposed M4-M5 tunnel alignment? If so, the EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these are all disclosed, researched, surveyed and the resolution publicly published.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name ___________________________ Email ___________________________ Mobile ___________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Signature: Danielle Morgan

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 30 Bourne Lane, Newtown

Suburb: Newtown

Postcode: 2042

A. Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces provided for workers (EiS). The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately 550. This means that 150 vehicles will need to park in nearby local streets which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.

B. There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

C. There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be date. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.

D. EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.

E. SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.

F. I am deeply disappointed that the EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain. This is a dangerous and reckless attempt to get approval for a project that is yet to be properly designed.

G. I strongly object to the proposed location of this permanent operational facility on Darley Road. The presence of this site contradicts repeated assurances to the community that the site would be returned after construction was completed. The ongoing presence of this site will limit future uses of the darley Road site which could serve community purposes, particularly given its location directly next to public transport. Its presence removes the ability to provide more accessible, safer and direct pedestrian access to the North Leichhardt Light Rail Station. The plant location, in a neighbourhood setting is not appropriate. It will reduce property values and have an unacceptable impacts on the visual amenity of the area. The streets adjacent to Darley Road are comprised of low-rise residential homes and small businesses and infrastructure such as this should not be permitted in such a location.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name __________________________ Email __________________________ Mobile __________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: c_s;
Signature: 

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 1/0a Cargo St
Suburb: New Town
Postcode: 1402

i. The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.

ii. The EIS acknowledges that ‘rat running’ by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.

iii. I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

iv. Traffic operational modelling – Leichhardt. The EIS does not provide any operational modelling for the Darley Road area (8-11), despite the fact 170 vehicles a day are proposed to enter this highly congested (during peak hours) area. Darley Road is a critical arterial road for commuters accessing the City West Link and this analysis should be provided so that impacts can be properly assessed.

v. Removal of vegetation – Leichhardt. The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the Darley Road site. There are several mature trees located on the north of the site. None of these trees should be removed as they provide precious greenery. They also act as a visual and noise screen for residents from the City West Link traffic. All efforts should be taken to retain the trees and the EIS should not simply permit these trees to be removed without proper investigations being undertaken as to how they can be retained. If they are removed following a proper investigation and consideration of all options, then the approval needs to specify that all streets are replaced with mature, native trees at the conclusion of the construction at the site.

vi. In the EIS there are indications of what is to be expected in the Rozelle Rail Yards construction site and the Crescent Civil site. But the EIS states that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed. This may result in major changes to the project design and construction methodologies. The community will have no input into this process, so the community is totally powerless to be able to comment on what will actually be proposed, how it will be carried out and what will finally be built. This is not acceptable.

vii. Permanent substation and water treatment plant – Leichhardt: I object to the location of this facility in our neighbourhood as out of step with the surroundings. If it is retained, then it should be moved to the north of the site, out of view from homes. The residual land should be returned for community purposes such as parkland.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name
Email
Mobile
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

1. I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

2. Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.

3. It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.

4. The substation and water treatment plant should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link. This will mean that the site is less visible to residents and most pedestrian access is at this end. There are no homes that will have direct line of site of the facility if it is moved. This will also enable direct pedestrian access to the light rail without the need to use the winding path at the rear of the site which creates safety issues and adds to the time required to access the light rail stop.

5. The warm and caring words contained in the EIS, ref Sustainability Management Strategy, have not been reflected in the wanton destruction of homes, trees and habitat already. Why should we believe them?

6. I am concerned that while the EIS finds that tolls do weigh more heavily on lower income motorists, there is no serious analysis of the blatant unfairness of letting of private consortium toll people for decades in order to pay for less profitable tollways for wealthier communities.

7. We object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that it provides for daily movements of 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road. This creates an unacceptable risk to the safety of pedestrians accessing the North Leichhardt light rail stop as well as bicycle users accessing the bicycle route on Darley Road and entering Canal road to join the dedicated bike paths on the bay run. Many school children cross at this point to walk to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College. The EIS states that an alternative truck movement is proposed which involves use of the City West Link with no trucks to access Darley Road. The selection of Darley Road should not be approved if it involves any truck movements on Darley Road, which is what it currently provides.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties.

Name __________________________ Email __________________________ Mobile __________________________
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

a) It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

b) Crash statistics – City West Link and James St intersection. The EIS only analyses crash statistics near the interchanges. It does not provide any detail as to the number of crashes at the James St / City West Link intersection which, on Transport for NSW’s own figures, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Nor does it comment on the two fatalities that occurred on Darley Road near the proposed construction site. The EIS needs to detail the increased risk in crashes that will be caused by the additional 170 vehicles a day that are proposed to enter and leave Darley Road during the construction period.

c) The EIS states that by 2033 Ross St will see an increase of 80 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. The greatest increase of Heavy vehicles at the PM peak will be in Johnston Street, which will see an increase of about 30–50 vehicles when compared to the ‘without project’ scenario. At Catherine St there will be an increase of 30 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. These streets will see a huge increase in Heavy vehicle movements if Stage 3 is built. The increase would be roughly half this amount if the project did not go ahead. Annexure Fig 26 B2 Section H

d) The EIS shows a diagrammatic explanation of the way the polluted air will be expelled from the WestConnex tunnels. This method will work on straight tunnels of short distance providing there is no traffic congestion. There are already signs in tunnel locations in Sydney advising motorists to roll up their windows and put on their ‘in vehicle circulating’ air conditioning. This type of straight line pollution expulsion doesn’t work if the tunnels go around corners, which is the case with the tunnels from the Rozelle Rail Yards site.

e) The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

f) I am concerned that the EIS provides no reasons why the City of Sydney’s alternative plan might not be preferable to the proposed WestCONnex.