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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney’s congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
Extra comments

I know what poor air quality means. I can't believe a NSW government would deliberately inflict it on Sydneysiders - especially in the name of an outmoded solution to traffic problems.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Gordon Williams
Kate Kuely  
kt.kuely@gmail.com  
2 Jarocin Ave  
Glebe NSW 2037 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Kate Kuely
Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Ann Walker
Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.
The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney’s waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, [Name]

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

Please reply to [Email]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Petra Jacos
Kristjan Garcia-Lamerton
bladekay@gmail.com
21 Stanley St
Leichhardt NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Kristjan Garcia-Lamerton
Attention Director  
Application Number: SSI 7485

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

Application Name:  
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name:  
Linda Kleuler

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

Address:  
Alta Mnt St

Suburb:  
Balmain  
Postcode:  
2041

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

- The nature of proposed "post-opening mitigation measures" (Page 223, Chapter 9.8, Appendix H) are unknown and their impacts could be significant including intersection and road widening (and associated property loss), banning parking in local centres, removal of trees, footpaths and cycling facilities. The people of NSW have a reasonable expectation to understand whether such impacts form part of the Project and they should be detailed in the EIS. They should not be left to a "wait and see" approach. Not only a proper analysis of demand, but also of traffic dispersion should be provided for connecting roads up to three kilometres from every exit and entry portal and the capacity of those roads analysed.

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

- The EIS says traffic on ANZAC Bridge will increase by 2023 (p.8-103).

- Traffic modelling shows bus times will be slower into the city in the morning (p.3-19).

- The EIS identifies capacity constraints on ANZAC Bridge (p3-19). This project will dump more traffic onto the ANZAC Bridge.

- 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.

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

- I object to the whole project but particularly the tolls which are unfair when people living west of Parramatta really need alternative to western neighborhoods north-south. If we had better public transport then many of us would not have to drive and this would reduce the traffic.

- The modelling has thousands of unreleased cars at key locations; i.e. in reality those unreleased vehicles would result in vehicle queues and or network failure.

- The strategic model (whole system) inputs traffic volumes that simply cannot be accommodated in the road interchanges and feeder routes. It is physically impossible to fit that amount of traffic on a road.
I wish to register my strong objection to WCX's proposed Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link), particularly in Rozelle. Reasons for my objection include:

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

While WCX might integrate with the wider motorway network, no evidence is provided demonstrating that it integrates with the wider road network – let alone the broader transport and land use system. The EIS provides no information about changes in traffic volumes entering the Sydney CBD caused by WCX, and Iron Cove Bridge (earmarked for more traffic) is already at capacity twice a day.

RMS has only just commenced work to identify which roads fanning out from WestConnex portals will need to be upgraded to deliver large numbers of vehicles to and from the project. It is therefore impossible to form a properly informed understanding of the environmental impacts – the very purpose of the EIS.

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

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

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

Name: 
Address:  
Postcode:  
Signature: 

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

Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Submission to Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
Application Number: SSI 7485
Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

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

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

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

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

Name: [Signed]
Address: 21 Perry St, Lilyfield
Postcode: 2040
Signature: [Signed]

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

Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. [ ]
Submission to Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
Application Number: SSI 7485
Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

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

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

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

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

Name: Susan Read
Address: 21 Percy St Unfold
Postcode: 2040
Signature: [Signature]

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

Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
Submission to Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
Application Number: SSI 7485
Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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

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

While WCX might integrate with the wider motorway network, no evidence is provided demonstrating that it integrates with the wider road network – let alone the broader transport and land use system. The EIS provides no information about changes in traffic volumes entering the Sydney CBD caused by WCX, and Iron Cove Bridge (earmarked for more traffic) is already at capacity twice a day.

RMS has only just commenced work to identify which roads fanning out from WestConnex portals will need to be upgraded to deliver large numbers of vehicles to and from the project. It is therefore impossible to form a properly informed understanding of the environmental impacts – the very purpose of the EIS.

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

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

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

Name: Susan Lead
Address: 21 Perry St, Lilyfield
Postcode: 2040

Signature: Susan Lead

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

YES NO

Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.

- Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware and Enmore Roads and through the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.

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

- 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.

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. **Permanent substation and water treatment plant – Leichhardt:** I object to the location of this facility in our neighbourhood as out of step with the surroundings. If it is retained, then it should be moved to the north of the site, out of view from homes. The residual land should be returned for community purposes such as parkland.

---

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

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

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

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

3. **Discharge of water into storm water at Blackmore Oval – Leichhardt.** The permanent substation and water treatment plant proposed for the Darley Road site facility should not be approved as part of the EIS. It proposes discharging water from the tunnels into the storm water canal near Blackmore Oval. This will devastate our waterways and impact negatively on the amenity of the bay which has four rowing clubs in close proximity. In addition, the environmental impacts of this discharge are not properly set out in the EIS.

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

5. **Removal of vegetation – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the Darley Road site. There are several mature trees located on the north of the site. None of these trees should be removed as they provide precious greenery. They also act as a visual and noise screen for residents from the City West Link traffic. All efforts should be taken to retain the trees and the EIS should not simply permit these trees to be removed without proper investigations being undertaken as to how they can be retained. If they are removed (following a proper investigation and consideration of all options) then the approval needs to specify that all streets are replaced with mature, native trees at the conclusion of the construction at the site.

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the 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 these will occur near the Darley Road site. There is no detail provided, nor is there a process by which residents can influence such decisions. The Inner West Council documents state that Darley Road is not built to normal road requirements and safety standards, as it was established as an access road for the former goods line. Two fatalities have occurred near the site location, with many accidents. The Council has been trying to make Darley Road a safer route for many years. Elwick Street North for example was partially closed as a result of a fatality. The approval conditions need to make it clear that all road closures need to be made in consultation with residents affected and that the safety issues are adequately addressed. No arterial traffic from Darley Road should be allowed to be diverted onto narrow local roads.

- The EIS states that after the M4-m5 opens, that traffic on Darley Road will increase by 4%. There is no benefit in the overall project for residents. During construction westbound traffic will increase on Darley Road by 37%. This increase in traffic for a period of up to five years will make it hazardous to cross the road and access the light rail and travel to Blackmore oval, the bat run, the dog park and the Leichhardt pool. In addition, it will drastically increase both local traffic and outer area traffic at peak commute times. We therefore object to the location of this site based on the unacceptable traffic impacts it will have on road users and on pedestrians.

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

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

Address:

Suburb: ...LEICHhardt... NSW Postcode: 2040

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

(2) The Hawthorne canal, which is the closest waterway to the Darley Road site, is described in the EIS as a ‘sensitive receiving environment’. (Executive Summary, xix). Darley Road is a contaminated site with asbestos and the water treatment plant to be established during construction proposes running water from the treatment plant directly into the waterways. The permanent water treatment plant will involve water from the tunnel discharged to local stormwater systems and waterways, therefore this is a permanent impact. This proposal will further compromise the quality of the waterway and impact on the four rowing clubs in close vicinity.

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

(4) The EIS currently permits trucks to access local roads in ‘exceptional circumstances’, which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the site (and based on experience with cars accessing the site for Dan Murphy’s), queuing will be the norm and not the exception. The EIS needs to be amended to rule our queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.

2. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS has many caveats and depends upon further steps (such as traffic management plans), the detail of which is not provided. The community has no certainty that any of the impacts from construction will be managed to an acceptable level.

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

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

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

6. There are 36 homes identified as having severe noise impacts during construction in Leichhardt and Lilyfield. No noise barriers have been identified so residents are unable to comment as to whether this impact will be reduced. No proposal for alternative accommodation is provided. This is unacceptable and all of the proposed noise mitigation options should be detailed in the EIS so that residents have an opportunity to comment on what is proposed. (Executive Summary xvii)

7. There is no plan to manage traffic on Darley Road proposed in the EIS. This critical arterial road is regularly congested at peak periods. Reference in the EIS to developing a traffic management plan in the future is not acceptable. The detail of what is proposed needs to be contained in the EIS so that residents can assess whether the impact of 170 light and heavy vehicle movements a day in and out of the site can be acceptably managed.

---

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

Name: ___________________________ Email: ___________________ Mobile: ______________
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 the 'main risks' during construction would be associated with dust soiling and the effect of airborne particles and human health and amenity (xii). This will affect local air quality. There is no detail on how this will be managed other than covering the spoil under an acoustic shed (of low grade). It is likely the Dan Murphys building has asbestos which creates additional risk during the demolition process.

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

The EIS needs to provide specific detail as to what will be provided by way of alternative accommodation to the 36 residents identified as suffering extreme noise interference. There is no plan to temporarily relocate such residents, not to offer them financial compensation to enable them to move out during the worst period. There is an estimated 10 weeks of extreme noise during demolition of the commercial building and preparatory road works. Once this work is finished the residents will also be forced to endure a truck every 3-4 minutes for a period of five years. It is clearly not possible for such residents to continue to live in these houses and the EIS needs to detail what will be provided in terms of alternative living arrangements for part, or all of the construction work period.
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.

I. The EIS states that the 'main risks' during construction would be associated with dust soiling and the effect of airborne particles and human health and amenity. This will affect local air quality. There is no detail as to how this will be managed other than covering the spoil under an acoustic shed (of low grade). It is likely the Dan Murphys building has asbestos which creates additional risk during the demolition process.

II. The EIS needs to provide specific detail as to what will be provided by way of alternative accommodation to the 36 residents identified as suffering extreme noise interference. There is no plan to temporarily relocate such residents, not to offer them financial compensation to enable them to move out during the worst period. There is an estimated 10 weeks of extreme noise during demolition of the commercial building and preparatory road works. Once this work is finished the residents will also be forced to endure a truck every 3-4 minutes for a period of five years. It is clearly not possible for such residents to continue to live in these houses and the EIS needs to detail what will be provided in terms of alternative living arrangements for part, or all of the construction work period.

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 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 EIS states that after the M4-m5 opens, that traffic on Darley Road will increase by 4%. There is no benefit in the overall project for residents. During construction westbound traffic will increase on Darley Road by 37%. This increase in traffic for a period of up to five years will make it hazardous to cross the road and access the light rail and travel to Blackmore oval, the bat run, the dog park and the Leichhardt pool. In addition, it will drastically increase both local traffic and outer area traffic at peak commute times. We therefore object to the location of this site based on the unacceptable traffic impacts it will have on road users and on pedestrians.
I 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. **Heavy vehicle movements during peak hours – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that ‘reasonable and practical management strategies would be investigated to minimize the volume of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours.’ (8-53). This is also not acceptable as it is not known what will actually be done to manage this impact. It is not good enough for the EIS, which forms the basis of the approval of this project, to simply mention ‘investigations’ and not detail a proper plan (on which residents can comment) on management of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours. In addition, Darley Road is very congested from 7am until 9.30am and then from 4pm-6.30pm, well outside the ‘peak’ periods identified in the EIS. And the impact on traffic will be caused by ‘light’ vehicles and not simply heavy vehicles. It is clear that there is no plan for managing these vehicle movements. The EIS should not be approved as drafted. It is unacceptable for this volume of vehicles to be proposed for this critical arterial road with no plan for management.

2. **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.

3. **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.

4. **Intersection of James St and City West Link** – The EIS (8-630 indicates that there will be an increase in traffic volume during construction of nearly 400 vehicles during peak hour. The only strategy to manage this is allowing a right-hand turn into James Street. This intersection is the third most dangerous in the inner west (based on TfNSW’s own statistics). There is no analysis of crash statistics at this intersection provided in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved in its current form. It needs to provide certainty to the community that they will be able to reasonable access this part of the road network in a timely and safe manner.

**Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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. **Acquisition and demolition of Dan Murphys** – I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. It is also wasteful that several million dollars was spent on renovations, for the entire structure to be demolished less than 18 months later.

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

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

4. **Permanent substation and water treatment plant** - Residents on Darley Rd opposite the site and residents in Hubert St will have a direct line of site to the Motorway operation infrastructure. The resultant impact is a permanent degradation of the visual environment, is a loss of amenity and is detrimental to the community. This facility should not be permitted in this location and the EIS needs to demonstrate why it is required at this site. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site out of line of site of residents. The residual land should be returned for community purposes, such as green space, with future commercial uses ruled out. If the community is forced to endure 5 years of severe disruptions due to this toll road, the compensation should, at the very least, result in the land being returned to the community as green space.

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

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

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

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

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

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

5. **Permanent substation and water treatment plant – Leichhardt**: I object to the location of this facility in our neighbourhood as out of step with the surroundings. If it is retained, then it should be moved to the north of the site, out of view from homes. The residual land should be returned for community purposes such as parkland.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application #SSI 7485 for the reason(s) set out below.

Hours of operation

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

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

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

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

' Reasonable and feasible work practices and mitigation measures would be implemented to minimise potential noise impacts due to activities occurring at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would be kept informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.'

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

I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.
I wish to register my strong objections to Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link). My reasons are set out below:

1. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement “may occur in the future” 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 e.g. John St at 22 metres, Hill St at 28 metres, Moore St at 27 metres, Piper St at 37 metres (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28 metres (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

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

3. Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces provided for workers (EIS). The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately 550. This means that there will be 150 vehicles will need to park in nearby local streets which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.

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

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

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

7. Unacceptable noise levels will accompany the construction of this massive interchange. No analysis has been provided of the magnitude of increased noise pollution in this area. There will also be disturbance of soil which may be thick with contaminants such as lead and asbestos (as was the case in St Peters.) You made no provision for the safe removal of these toxic substances in St Peters and I do not see any provision in the EIS for their safe removal in this area.
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS M4/M5 Application, for the following reasons:

1. I strongly object to the unknown hazard associated with two different tunnelling operations taking place in close proximity in time and location - the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link and the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown. The impact of this combined tunnelling is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the residences and buildings above, many of them very old and heritage listed. This is a serious community safety issue and residents who experience damage will be caught between 2 separate contractors for repairs and compensation.

2. I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the deadline for submission of comments on the concept design. The formal response to the 1000s of comments and submissions on the design, released only after the EIS, cannot possibly be based on a full assessment and consideration of the community responses. This is an insult to the community and questions the integrity of the entire EIS process.

3. The decision to build a three-stage tollway of the scale and complexity proposed and that has never been built before is risking community safety and state resources. I strongly object to that fact that this risk 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.

4. The original objectives of WestConnex was to improve road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany with the interchange now being built at St Peters located much closer to the airport. This contradicts the stated purpose of the extension of the M4. Now both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1000s more cars per day onto the roads to the airport which are already over-crowded and competing with freight transport. I strongly object to the impact of the M4/M5 link as it fails to meet the original purpose and provide a sustainable rail link to enable freight to be moved out of the city and commuters to travel by public transport.

5. Across all 3 stages the business case has not 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.

6. The high cost of the tolls has already resulted in an increase in traffic on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. Their anticipated annual increase will likely mean that more and more commuters will seek to avoid the expensive tolls. It makes sense to expect the same effect on the roads around the St Peters Interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Cigarette Rd and Enmore Rd and though the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria. The increasing numbers of vehiclies will mean more vehicle pollution in the area (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic). A viable public train system would easily and effectively manage commuter traffic without the requirement for expensive private tollways.

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

Heritage impacts
5. 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 xvii)

Property acquisition support service
6. 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 xvii)

Biodiversity
7. 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.

Visual amenity
8. 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)

Lack of ability to comment on the urban design as part of the approval process
9. 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.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed 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: Jerome Peacock
Signature: [Signature]

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

Address: 138 William St
Suburb: Leichhardt
Postcode: 2040

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

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

3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically 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.

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

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

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

Name ___________________ Email ___________________ Mobile ___________________
I 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.

- Current noise measures – Leichhardt: The EIS states that 'reasonable and feasible work practices and mitigation measures would be implemented to minimise potential noise impacts due to activities occurring at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site.' (96-52) This is not good enough. The EIS does not contain any detail whatsoever of these proposal on which they can comment. In addition, there is no requirement that measures will in fact be introduced to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain detail of specific noise mitigation measures that are mandated and can be enforced.

- Acoustic shed – Leichhardt: 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.' (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.

- Return of the site after construction – Leichhardt: 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 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.

- Worker car parking – Leichhardt: 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 reference to 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.

- Accidents – Leichhardt: I object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site because of the unacceptable risk it will create to the safety of our community. The traffic forecasts indicate that Darley Road will have 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day. Darley Road is a known accident and traffic blackspot and the movements of hundreds of trucks a day will create an unacceptable risk of accidents. On Transport for NSW’s own figures, the intersection at the City West Link and James Street is the third most dangerous in the inner west. The addition of hundreds of heavy truck movements a day into that intersection will increase the risk of serious accidents for both pedestrians and drivers. The EIS states that the levels of service are expected to Darley Road is directly next to the North Leichhardt Light Rail stop which is a pedestrian hub. Children travelling to school walk to the stop. Active transport users such as bicycle riders will be at risk, along with pedestrians using Canal Road to access the Bay Run, Leichhardt pool and the dog park.

- Traffic – Leichhardt: I object to the location of the Darley Road civil and construction site because the site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. It is already congested at peak hours and the intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application #SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

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 minimise during the construction period and, in particular, during site establishment.

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

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 prohibit 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.

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

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

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

Name: Cullin Cole
Signature: C. Cole

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: 155 Trafalgar St, Stanmore, NSW, 2048
Suburb: Stanmore
Postcode: 2048

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. The EIS currently permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the site (and based on experience with cars accessing the site for Dan Murphy's), queuing will be the norm and not the exception. The EIS needs to be amended to rule our queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads.

4. 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.

5. 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.

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Mandy Woods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>9-7D14 Pearson Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb:</td>
<td>2050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Signed: Anna May Kyle Date 26/7/17

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

- **Contaminated site**

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

  7 Darley Road is a site which has been reported to the NSW EPA under section 60 of the CLM Act. Although NSW EPA assessed the site as not requiring regulation under the CLM Act in 16.2.14 of the EIS the proponent sets out in Table 16-15 the contaminants of potential concern that are present at Darley Rd. These are metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, total recoverable hydrocarbons, asbestos and Volatile Organic Hydrocarbons (SVOCs).

  The proponent's plan for the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt involves demolition, earthworks, construction and track-out (the transport of dust and dirt from the construction/demolition site onto the public road network on construction vehicles).

  I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of contaminants will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.

- **Asbestos contaminated site**

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

  Appendix R, 4.7.8 Areas and contaminants of concern the proponent states that 'There is also potential for asbestos to be present in the fill from potential uncontrolled filling and demolition of former buildings.'
The proponent's assessment is defective as it fails to identify the risk to local residents and anyone else in the neighbourhood of excavated soil containing contaminants and asbestos being blown into nearby streets and into homes and gardens of adjoining properties. The proponent's assessment is defective because having identified the presence of asbestos on the site it fails to specifically identify the potential for inhalation of asbestos either by workers or residents.

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of asbestos will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.
Traffic and transport – hours of operation for spoil removal

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

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

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

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

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

The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Alternatives have been identified which will allow spoil haulage directly onto the City West Link and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.
I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS tollroad proposal.

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Claire O’Neill
Kate Ippolito
kateippolito@hotmail.com
130 Elswick St
Leichhardt NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link EIS tollroad proposal. Global experience of major toll roads demonstrates that these projects are enormously expensive and counter-productive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity. It is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. The negative impacts on the health and well-being of local community's both in the construction and operation phases are unacceptable.

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Kate Ippolito
Philip Tauberman
phil.tauberman@gmail.com
130 Elswick St
Leichhardt NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Philip Tauberman
Michelle French
michelle@frenchbaker.net.au
55 College St
Balmain NSW 2041 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
I strongly believe that public transport is the answer!!

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Michelle French
Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
Public money must be spent on the most efficient forms of transport that benefit the most. Google pulled out of having a site that fed off the WestConnex because it considered the location to be inefficient for its employees to travel to. The City of Sydney is against the project for the same reasons. Stop the WestConnex now.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Joanna Robinski
Laetitia Shepherd
Laetitia678@yahoo.de
177-219 Mitchell Rd
Erskineville NSW 2033 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Laetitia Shepherd
Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
Extra comments

The destruction of communities, the encouragement of more cars and thus more fossil fuels/mining/drilling, the discouragement of efficient public transport, the wreckage of green spaces and corridors for wildlife, noise and air pollution, the uglification of Sydney, the massive tolls for western Sydney residents, the danger construction poses to pedestrians, cyclists and local neighbourhoods: these are a few of the reasons we need to put a permanent stop to Westconnex.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Hilary Bell
Phillip Johnston
phillip@phillipjohnston.com
193 Norton St
Leichhardt NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department’s website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Phillip Johnston
Phillip Johnston
phillip@phillipjohnston.com
193 Norton St
Leichhardt NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Phillip Johnston
Shefali Rovik
shefali.rovik@justice.nsw.gov.au
2A Wells St
Newtown NSW 2042 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
Extra comments

There seems to be so little intelligent planning and a complete disregard for the communities that WestConnex is destroying under the guise of meeting the needs of development.

Public transport is being privatised and cut and the decision to make clearways on King St. after acknowledging the destruction of local businesses and communities by making Parramatta Rd a clearway suggest that the NSW has vested interests in not listening to the people who actually live in the areas affected.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Nadia Warne
Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Nadia Warne
Robert Irvine
guauen@gmail.com
16 Stanmore Rd
Enmore NSW 2042 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
Extra comments

The 'indicative' EIS is a farce, like the motorway scam itself. Sydney's inner west is choked with cars and trucks. Massive radial motorways just make it worse and harm all affected communities. The roads of the inner west were laid out 150 years ago.

A new vision is needed. The inner west needs a public interest transport plan with frequent, interlinked public transport; safe bike lanes; safe pedestrian footpaths, and off street vehicle parking.

The only purpose of this motorway is to enrich the constructors and corporate owners. Shame, Ms Berejeklian, shame!

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

- The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity.
- An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow ‘swoosh’ that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be ‘encouraged’ to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that ‘definitive’ rather than ‘indicative’ alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair ‘definitive’ document open for genuine public comment.
- The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other.
- The business case for the project in all three stages has failed to taken into account the external costs of these massive road projects in air pollution for human and environmental health, in adding fossil fuel emissions to increase global warming effects, and in the economic and social costs of the disruption to human activities, of displacement of people and businesses and of the destruction of community cohesion and amenity. These external costs far outweigh any benefits from building roads which poorly serve people’s transport needs but instead enrich private corporations.
- The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters Interchange will have a heavy disruptive impact on the local transport routes, whether by vehicle, bus, or active transport (walking and cycling).
- Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware and Enmore Roads and through the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.
- The increasing numbers of vehicles will also increase the vehicle pollution (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic) in this area. The decision to build a three-stage tollway instead of expanding public transport has never been subjected to democratic decision-making and in fact has been opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages. EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. “… this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval”. It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a “review(ed) for consistency”, and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

be approved till significant 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie: the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)
I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity.

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

- The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other.

- The business case for the project in all three stages has failed to taken into account the external costs of these massive road projects in air pollution for human and environmental health, in adding fossil fuel emissions to increase global warming effects, and in the economic and social costs of the disruption to human activities, of displacement of people and businesses and of the destruction of community cohesion and amenity. These external costs far outweigh any benefits from building roads which poorly serve people’s transport needs but instead enrich private corporations.

- The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters Interchange will have a heavy disruptive impact on the local transport routes, whether by vehicle, bus, or active transport (walking and cycling).

- Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware and Enmore Roads and through the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.

- The increasing numbers of vehicles will also increase the vehicle pollution (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic) in this area. The decision to build a three-stage tollway instead of expanding public transport has never been subjected to democratic decision-making and in fact has been opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages. EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. “...... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval”. It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a “review(ed) for consistency”, and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not
Attention Director
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

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:

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)

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

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below.

----------------------------------------------- IF YOU POISON OUR CHILDREN WITH UNFILTERED EMISSIONS. IT WILL LEAD TO THE BIGGEST CLASS ACTION NSW HAS EVER SEEN.

WE WILL FUCKING BANKRUPT YOU. MARK MY WORDS...

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

Please reply to

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
From: campaigns@good.do
Sent: Sunday, 15 October 2017 2:01 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

------------------------------------------------------------------ DO NOT POISON OUR CHILDREN WITH UNFILTERED EMISSIONS. OTHERWISE IT WILL INEVITABLY LEAD TO THE BIGGEST CLASS ACTION NSW HAS EVER SEEN.

MARK MY WORDS...

I strongly object to this proposal and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent, more residents' lives are damaged, and our children are poisoned by avoidable particulate matter, LEADING TO THE BIGGEST CLASS ACTION NSW HAS SEEN since the Hardies Asbestos Scandal.

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 filth.

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

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

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of this poisonous filth.

Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments.

The “LNP” Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that

“NO VENTILATION SHAFTS WILL BE BUILT NEAR ANY SCHOOL IN HIS ELECTORATE”.

The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car
emissions from the traffic. Mary Street is at the head of canal road and will most definitely become more of a rat run with a huge amount of extra car emissions which are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

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

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

------------------------------------------ DO NOT POISON OUR CHILDREN WITH UNFILTERED EMISSIONS. OTHERWISE IT WILL LEAD TO THE BIGGEST CLASS ACTION NSW HAS EVER SEEN.

MARK MY WORDS...

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

Please reply to [email]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

Objection to WestCONnex M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I completely object to WestConnex and the WestConnex EIS.

The subsidence that our house risks is not acceptable – we just did a sustainable renovation, on a 115 year old timber cottage. Our intention was to give our house another 115 years. But the subsidence could crack our floors and walls, and most significantly, crack the new green roof that sits on top of our whole kitchen/living area. It could also crack our solar-powered, rainwater-filled pool, and our new terrace.

The air pollution from the stacks is unacceptable – not filtering is just not good enough! Also, at nearly 40m high, the stacks will look overwhelming – they will literally tower over everything else. Another solution must be possible.

Anzac Bridge, Victoria Rd, and City West Link are already at capacity – the increase in traffic will be unbearable.

We have no opportunity to consultation about the construction sites, which will produce huge amounts of noise and dust for years and years.

And most importantly, the whole WestConnex project seems to be a sham – the companies benefiting most from this project have given millions of dollars in donations to both Liberal and Labour in NSW. What people need is leadership from our government, delivering more liveable cities with affordable transport that supports and strengthens everyone's physical and mental health. WestConnex is the antithesis of this. Projects like WestConnex will drive people away from Sydney – global cities elsewhere in the world are investing in fantastic public transport, not motorways.

Yours sincerely, Elizabeth Harry 92 Foucart St, Rozelle, New South Wales, Australia

This email was sent by Elizabeth Harry via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Elizabeth provided an email address (lizharry007@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Elizabeth Harry at lizharry007@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

BALMAIN COAL MINE WORKINGS

From the maps that Westconnex has put out, do you realise that the Western Harbour Tunnel will go straight through the SOUTH LEAD OF THE MINE. There are uncharted mine galleries there. As well, the broken pipes have been leaking METHANE GAS INTO THE SANDSTONE OF BALMAIN FOR THE LAST 74 YEARS. The Mines department could/would not supply copies of the mine workings to me.

EFFECT OF VIBRATION FROM M4/M5 TUNNELS ON THE LINEAR ACCELERATORS AND NATIONAL NUCLEAR REACTOR WHICH MAKES ISOTOPES FOR AUSTRALIA.

Have calculations have been made for the long term effect on the above. YOU DO NOT WANT TO HAVE CHERNOBAL NO2.'

RAISED LUNG CANCER RATES FROM UNFILTERED SMOKESTACKS

Professor Paul Torzillo, Head of Respiratory Medicine, RPAH has predicted that there will be an increase in cancer and related diseases from the smokestacks.

He has had more experience than any of the committee who have said that there will be little effect on the lung health of the community.

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

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

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.
With four unfiltered emissions stacks in Rozelle, two in Haberfield (one each for the M4East and New M5) and two in St Peters, along with a large number of exit portals, residents of these areas will suffer greatly from direct exposure to poisonous diesel particulates.

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

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

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

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

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

The pollution will be trapped by inversion layers across the Sydney Basin.

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

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

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

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

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)
Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.
I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Alice Kershaw 3 Padstow St, Rozelle NSW 2039, Australia

---

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

Please reply to Alice Kershaw at alicekershaw@bigpond.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, John Jeffery 96 Day St, Leichhardt NSW 2040, Australia

This email was sent by John Jeffery via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however John provided an email address (johnjeffery11@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to John Jeffery at johnjeffery11@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEXX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below.

Most importantly I strongly oppose the unfiltered smoke stake placed just a few meters from my home, park and the school my children will go to. It's absolutely unacceptable that no precautions are being taken to protect health and lives of our children!!!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.
I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Martin Paino 36 Burt St, Rozelle NSW 2039, Australia
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please reply to Jennifer Surridge at jenny@sff.org.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attention: Director, Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services Department of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

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

Name: Maryanne Galea
Organisation: 
Address: 48 Charles St Suburb Leichhardt Post Code 2040
Email: maryannegalea@hotmail.com

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

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

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

Hours of operation

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

Non-compliance with SEARS

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

In so far as it describes the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt the EIS does not meet this requirement because it does not describe the components and activities that have been described to the community either in meetings with LAW (Leichhardt Against WestConnex) or at the WestConnex Community Reference Group established by Sydney Motorway Corporation.

Construction vehicle safety impacts

I object to the EIS because the proposal in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt stated therein, that 'heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt' presents unacceptable safety and amenity impacts.

The corner of Darley Rd (actually James St) and the City West Link is a pedestrian zone for:
- Pupils of Orange Grove Public School who live in Leichhardt
- Students of Sydney Secondary College, Leichhardt Campus who alight at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Students of other schools along the light rail who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Commuters who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Residents walking to Leichhardt Park Aquatic Centre and adjacent sporting facilities
- Residents walking to the Orange Grove markets on Saturdays

The proponents plan brings pedestrians and school children in particular directly into the path of spoil haulage trucks at an intersection found to be the third most dangerous according to Transport for NSW figures.

A further impact will be to discourage people from walking in this area leading to greater car use for local trips.

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the above grounds.

Noise impacts

I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the fact that the demolition of 7 Darley Road, Leichhardt will remove a significant noise barrier to traffic noise from the City West Link. This will mean increased traffic noise impacts to the residents of Darley Rd, Francis St, Hubert St and Charles St.
Attention: Director, Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services Department of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

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

Name: Maryane Golea
Organisation: 
Address: 48 Works St, Suburb Leichhardt, Post Code 2040
Email: maryaneagolea@homail.com

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

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

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

**Hours of operation**

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

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

  ‘Reasonable and feasible work practices and mitigation measures would be implemented to minimise potential noise impacts due to activities occurring at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would be kept informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site.

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

**Noise impacts**

- The resident’s of Darley Rd, Francis, Hubert and Charles St have little acoustic protection against the noise of truck engines, exhaust and brakes and non is contemplated in the EIS.

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

**Noise impacts**

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

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

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

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

**Truck routes**

- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be detailed in the CTAMP, Preferred Infrastructure Report or Ancillary Facilities Management Plan.

  Peter Jones of SMC has on many occasions made representations to the community that his plan is to stage trucks from the port and eventually when possible to have them arrive and depart from the site underground when a tunnel is established between Leichhardt and the M4 East. He has also said that loading of spoil would take place underground at this time. He has recently told us of his plan to load trucks from a ramp off the city west link by means of a hopper conveyor which would pass over the Light rail station delivering spoil into silos below which trucks would pull up to receive their load. The laden trucks would then travel west bound along the city west link. None of this plan is detailed in the EIS.

  I object to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I object to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into the CTAMP, PIR or AFMP on matters which will have a devastating impact to me and to residents near 7 Darley Rd.
I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Giuseppina Bartolo
Lesley Strachan
bluegumlette@gmail.com
99 Lilyfiled Rd
Lilyfield NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney's congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Lesley Strachan
Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney’s congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

The billions spent on this project should be put towards a public transport system that will reduce the need for these roads. Sydney is now of such a density that a mass transit system would work like in advanced City already has. Even a small city like Copenhagen now has a metro rail system. The politicians don't even need to look to the future for these solutions, they are already established and work. Other cities are removing their inner city motorways, we are building them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.
I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, [Name]

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

Please reply to [Email]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link tollroad proposal.

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney’s congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
Extra comments

My concerns are the creation of rat runs through the suburbs close to Westconnex so that they don't have to pay the fees; also I will be in direct line from the unfiltered stacks—there is enough pollution now from overhead planes and Victoria Rd car exhaust fumes; concern re ongoing vibration underneath once the tunnels are being used and also structural damage to the home, let alone the effect on property prices.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Robyn Plaister
Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney’s congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Maddy Kirsch
Maia Marsh
maianielsen75@gmail.com
Unit 1 /
7-9 Kroombit St
Dulwich Hill NSW 2203 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney’s congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department’s Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department’s website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Maia Marsh
Glenn Much
itmeself2002@yahoo.com
NSW Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
I have read the Department’s Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department’s website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

Peter Wilson
Ian McKee
mckee54@yahoo.com
41 Charlotte St
Lilyfield NSW 2040 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
Extra comments

Time for truth transparency and action to serve all citizens, not just motorists.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
Extra comments

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Samantha Philp
Mohan Arianayagam
m.arianayagam@yahoo.com
Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
Extra comments

We need more trains. Stop building more roads that will just fill

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Mohan Arianayagam
Alison Taylor
alisonmtaylor@hotmail.com
147 Alexander St
Crows Nest NSW 2065 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
Extra comments

Great cities have great public transport. This M4/M5 will clog up our city with more cars and pollution

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Chris Baker
Vera Yee
vypk@unauthorised.org
1 McKye St
Waverton NSW 2060 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Vera Yee
Amelia Kerr
amelia_kerr@hotmail.com
Unit 3
190 Croydon Ave
Croydon Park NSW 2133 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) it will induce more traffic into the Inner West with increases in congestion on already highly congested major roads and increased congestion on local roads as commuters avoid the expensive tolls.

2) it will increase the negative health impacts by increasing toxic fine particle pollution especially in the vicinity of the unfiltered ventilation stacks which are located near schools and homes.

3) it will destroy the Rozelle to Balmain rail corridor thus removing the option for a rail link to the Balmain peninsula and the White Bay precinct.

4) it will impose significant and unsustainable tolls on western Sydney communities who will not have adequate public transport alternatives.

5) it will lead to the imposition of more clearways on high streets in the inner west which will destroy businesses and community amenity.

6) it will potentially damage significant aboriginal and non aboriginal heritage in the inner west.
Extra comments

I am most concerned about how the unfiltered smoke stacks will impact on our kids and pregnant women. The resulting pollution from WestConnex will only serve to cost more for the state in terms of harming peoples' health and not give future babies the best start in life:
http://www.futurity.org/air-pollution-premature-births-1150022/

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

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

Yours sincerely,

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West Link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Andrew Byrne 26 Wentworth Street

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

Please reply to Andrew Byrne at aobhrionn@hotmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-
basic.org/rfc-3834.html
From: Edward Farren-Price <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 14 October 2017 12:30 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I am totally unconvinced that this project has been properly planned and considered and would rather the funds are
invested into other public transport nodes such as trains, ferries, light rail and buses.

Yours sincerely,

Edward Farren-Price
37 Croydon Street

---------------------------------------------------------- This email was sent by Edward Farren-Price via Do Gooder, a website that allows
people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3844 we have set
the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Edward provided an
email address (efarrenprice@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Edward Farren-Price at efarrenprice@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3844 visit: www.rfc-
base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in
December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early
November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the
compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease
extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise
is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not
offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the
Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the
intersection near the site (James St and City west Link), based on TfNSW's own data, is the third most dangerous
intersection in the inner west. Despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an
additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied
belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and
accident black spot.

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

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

Kind Regards, Peta McGee Durham St, Stanmore NSW 2048, Australia

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

Please reply to Peta McGee at patti_mail@yahoo.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-
base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

Invest in public transport infrastructure not more private automobile roadways. We need multi-modal transport not more cars. !!!!!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Jon Green 153 Rochford St, Erskineville NSW 2043, Australia

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

Please reply to Jon Green at jonatgree@yahoo.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Mulphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise
is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not
offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the
Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the
intersection near the site 9james St and City west Lik), based on TfNSW's own data, is the third most dangerous
intersection in the inner west. despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an
additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied
belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and
accident black spot.

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

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

Yours sincerely, Bevin Aston 3/69 Ernest St, Crows Nest NSW 2065, Australia

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

Please reply to Bevin Aston at bevinaston@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-
base.org/rfc-3834.html
SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Kareejane@hotmail.com Oates 69 Hordern St, Newtown NSW 2042, Australia

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

Please reply to Karee Oates at kareejane@hotmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-
base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Option B must be rejected outright due to its devastating effects on Haberfield Public School.

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

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

The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise
is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not
offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the
Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the
intersection near the site 9 James St and City west Lik), based on TfNSW’s own data, is the third most dangerous
intersection in the inner west. Despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an
additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied
belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and
accident black spot.

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

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

Yours sincerely, Merinda Timpany Dalhousie St, Haberfield NSW 2045, Australia

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

Please reply to Merinda Timpany at Merinda.Timpany@dlapiper.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-
base.org/rfc-3834.html
SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the intersection near the site (James St and City west Link), based on TfNSW’s own data, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and accident black spot.

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

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

Yours sincerely, Kym Berry 17 Julia St, Ashfield NSW 2131, Australia

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

Please reply to Kym Berry at kym.worth@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, James Hope 68 Bream St, Coogee NSW 2034, Australia

This email was sent by James Hope via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to
contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the
FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however James provided an email
address (jimmyjet64@yahoo.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to James Hope at jimmyjet64@yahoo.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-
base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. The Westconnex project in its entirety has failed to comply with even basic standards of probity or governance. It does not address the original problem it was set up to address (airport link), nor will it significantly improve travel times for Sydneysiders – although it will increase transport costs enormously in terms of both money and population health. Why should it go ahead? I am yet to hear one convincing argument for its benefits to anyone other than those engaged in the game of mates: toll companies, developers and politicians grifting off the public purse.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the M5 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built — that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur — indeed, the State Opposition is opposed to both projects. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.
I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

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

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

The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the intersection near the site 9James St and City west Lik), based on TfNSW’s own data, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and accident black spot.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS. I urge the secretary of NSW planning to seek a comprehensive explanation as to why.

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

Yours sincerely, Sharyn Wise 2 Knight St, Erskineville NSW 2043, Australia

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

Please reply to Sharyn Wise at sharyn.wise@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
From: Jessica Green <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 14 October 2017 12:09 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Jessica Green 85 Burfitt St, Leichhardt NSW 2040, Australia

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

Please reply to Jessica Green at jessicalake@hotmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
From: Jane Burgess <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 14 October 2017 10:14 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

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

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

Unfiltered pollution stacks should not be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

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

I strongly object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has long queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the intersection near the site (James St and City West Link), based on TfNSW's own data, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and accident black spot.

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

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

Yours sincerely, Jane Burgess 27 Myrtle St, Leichhardt NSW 2040, Australia

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

Please reply to Jane Burgess at janekburgess@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

There needs to be a major investigation into this flagrant abuse of the way NSW planning principles have been flouted for the whole of Westconnex and particularly Stage 3.

I agree with the Inner West Council that the NSW government's decision to release the WestConnex Stage 3 EIS just days after the end of the consultation period on the Concept Design "short-changed the inner west community." We would add that it shortchanges all of those who will depend on transport in Sydney in the future.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a ‘plan'.
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The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the intersection near the site (James St and City west Lk), based on TfNSW’s own data, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and accident black spot.

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

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

Yours sincerely, Sue Fletcher 6 Charles St, Forest Lodge NSW 2037, Australia

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

Please reply to Sue Fletcher at susannefletcher@bigpond.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Sue Fletcher
susannefletcher@bigpond.com
6 Charles St
Forest Lodge NSW 2037 Australia

Your view on the application: I object to it

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

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

- Building WestConnex will increase air pollution and global warming and encourage more car use, quickly filling the increased road capacity.
- Increasing vehicle use by inducing more cars onto the road increases the risks related to climate change, including extreme rainfall and extreme heat events.
- This stage of WestConnex also facilitates the building of the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will see tunnels bored under the Balmain peninsula and generate a need for yet more exhaust stacks in and around Balmain.
- WestConnex is not a sustainable solution to Sydney’s congestion problem. It will have unacceptable impacts on the health and well-being of local communities, such as increasing toxic pollution levels from unfiltered exhaust smoke stacks located near schools and parks, especially in Rozelle.
- The government has not committed to a genuine consultation process - it released this M4-M5 Link proposal just two weeks after submissions closed for comment on the concept design, and only provided an eight week consultation period. This does not allow sufficient time for submissions from the community.
I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

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

Yours sincerely,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I am aghast that you would even consider the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. I use this road virtually every day and I can vouch that this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights – already a hopeless situation. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased. This will make the situation completely unbearable. The fact that you are considering t
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. It is completely inappropriate and disgusting. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Sara Marshall 24 Hubert St, Leichhardt NSW 2040, Australia

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

Please reply to Sara Marshall at saracmarshall@bigpond.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely, Heather Leishman 27 Woodbury St, Marrickville NSW 2204, Australia

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

Please reply to Heather Leishman at heather.leishman@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-
base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

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

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

Our community in Alexandria is starting to thrive with more residents, shops and cafes. We enjoy our access to the city and choose to walk and ride bicycles when we can. We enjoy a healthy lifestyle and our kids play in nearby parks and playgrounds.

Westconnex threatens to dismantle our new found living standard by bring 1000's more cars flooding onto our suburban streets. Our childrens health and safety will be diminished by this project.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.
I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

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

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

The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the intersection near the site 9James St and City West (Bed), based on TfNSW's own data, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and accident black spot.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Suzen Barnes Alexandria

This email was sent by Suzen Barnes via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Suzen provided an email address (suzenbarnes@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Suzen Barnes at suzenbarnes@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web.protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents’ lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur – indeed, the State Opposition is opposed to both projects. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated.(SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of much more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. I am appalled that these odours are predicted to possibly continue if Stage 3 is approved. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as
it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a
determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly
worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for
residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged
periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on
residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative
impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of
residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on
the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the
 provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever
impact will be managed by a ‘plan’.

The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise
is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not
offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the
Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the
intersection near the site (9James St and City west Lk), based on TINSW's own data, is the third most dangerous
intersection in the inner west. despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an
additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied
belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and
accident black spot.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up
with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in
accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have
raised.

Yours sincerely, Katy Andrews 37B Trafalgar St, Enmore NSW 2042, Australia

This email was sent by Katy Andrews via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the
FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Katy provided an email
display (katyandrews@outlook.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Katy Andrews at katyandrews@outlook.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-
base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below.

Things are so obscure that no one in the neighbourhood knows for sure what the plan is and what's going on. All the information presented in public meetings have been disputed and no response have been provided.

Perhaps NSW Planning cares, or more likely doesn't, I suggest a more direct debate between the sides to and against Westconnex happens to assuage all sides.

NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.
I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of much more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. I am appalled that these odours are predicted to possibly continue if Stage 3 is approved. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions
from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods. (Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Sze Ding 2/38 Cardigan Ln, Stanmore NSW 2048, Australia
From: June Cassidy <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 14 October 2017 11:09 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M4/M5 EIS, project number SSI 16_7485

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

Around the Erskinville/St Peters area there has been a significant increase in the number of apartments being built and that are going to be built in the next couple of years. Many of these apartments do not have adequate parking facilities and so people will need to park on the street. Traffic in this area, particularly on Mitchell, Coulson and McEvoy streets, is heavily congested. The plans for more traffic to be diverted here after WestConnex is built is ludicrous. It almost appears as though the department in charge of approving the building of apartments and the department in charge of building roads do not speak to each other. It is also appalling that billions is being spent on WestConnex and not much is being spent on public transport. Adding bus and train services across would make a significant difference to traffic around this area. Furthermore, the only way I learn about community consultation is from groups who have concerns with WestConnex. There is minimal information coming from the government. That the costs keep increasing and the plans keep changing strongly suggests that the people in charge do not know what they are doing and the government is too stubborn to reassess this plan. I understand that significant infrastructure projects disrupt lives as they are being built, but this will not improve traffic in Sydney. Building more roads is not the answer, as anyone who is stuck in traffic on the M5 will tell you.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.
I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated.(SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.
When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of much more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. I am appalled that these odours are predicted to possibly continue if Stage 3 is approved. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods. (Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary’s requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a ‘plan’.

The high number of residents in both Haberfield and Leichhardt who would require mitigation for horrific night noise is unacceptable, particularly because promises of mitigation in Haberfield and St Peters during Stage 2 have not offered adequate protection. The Darley Road proposed construction site has been rejected as highly unsuitable by the Inner Council Council, its traffic planners and the independent engineer appointed by the council. In fact, the intersection near the site (James St and City West Link) based on TfNSW’s own data, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Despite that, SMC wishes to bring in 100 heavy vehicle movements a day, plus an additional 70 light vehicle movements. There have been two fatalities directly out front the proposed site and it belied belief that SMC could seriously consider running hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery into a known traffic and accident black spot.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, June Cassidy
Unit 8406/177-219 Mitchell Rd, Erskineville NSW 2043, Australia

This email was sent by June Cassidy via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however June provided an email address (junith_81@Hotmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to June Cassidy at junith_81@Hotmail.com.
To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents’ lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of much more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. I am appalled that these odours are predicted to possibly continue if Stage 3 is approved. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as
it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a
determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly
worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for
residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged
periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on
residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative
impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of
residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on
the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the
provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever
impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up
with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in
accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have
raised.

In an era where the world is moving towards greener, cleaner alternatives to transport, the WestConnex is not the
answer. It is simply a monument of government corruption and greed.

Yours sincerely, ANITA SANDSTROM Belmont St, Alexandria NSW 2015, Australia

This email was sent by ANITA SANDSTROM via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however ANITA provided an email address (anitasandstrom@hotmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to ANITA SANDSTROM at anitasandstrom@hotmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

DO THE RIGHT THING, NOT THE EASY THING.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is misadministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.
During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney’s waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary’s requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a ‘plan’.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Brittany Cooper 125 Darley St, Newtown NSW 2042, Australia

This email was sent by Brittany Cooper via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Brittany provided an email address (britto.potamus@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Brittany Cooper at britto.potamus@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I have appalled at the lack of community consultation today on this project. I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below.

NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfILTERED stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.
During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods. (Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney’s waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary’s requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a ‘plan’.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Graeme Durkin 109 Union St, Newtown NSW 2042, Australia
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

To date I have been appalled at the lack of community consultation, the secrecy and lack of transparency. I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.
During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods. It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Graeme Durkin 109 Union St, Newtown NSW 2042, Australia

This email was sent by Graeme Durkin via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Graeme provided an email address (150mph@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Graeme Durkin at 150mph@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

I object to this because it is obvious the majority of residents affected do not want or agree with this tollway being built. I live in a regional area of NSW we are badly in need of services, like easy access to a railway service from Sydney to the NSW South Coast through to the Victorian border!! All we have right now is the Princes Highway to travel anywhere outside our region, totally inadequate, spend the money on us instead!!

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of much more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. I am appalled that these odours are predicted to possibly continue if Stage 3 is approved. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.
There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods (Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary’s requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a ‘plan’.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Judy Kirchner Burrill Lake NSW

This email was sent by Judy Kirchner via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Judy provided an email address (marleeone@bigpond.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Judy Kirchner at marleeone@bigpond.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

Westconnex is an environmental and cultural disaster.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents’ lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I completely reject this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents’ lives are damaged.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.
During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods. (Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a ‘plan’.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Narelle Jarvis 195 Pinchin Rd, Goolmangar NSW 2480, Australia
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.
During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods. (Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney’s waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary’s requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a ‘plan’.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Deborah Biancotti 56 Myrtle St, Chippendale NSW 2008, Australia
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The 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 shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi
financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated.(SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model's margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the
provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a ‘plan’.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Esther Levy 32 Francis St, Earlwood NSW 2206, Australia

The email was sent by Esther Levy via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Esther provided an email address (egljan72@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Esther Levy at egljan72@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH 'Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale' 5/10/2017)
Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of much more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. I am appalled that these odours are predicted to possibly continue if Stage 3 is approved. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods. (Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary’s requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a ‘plan’.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Camilla Lawson 147 Rochford St, Erskineville NSW 2043, Australia
FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Camilla provided an email address (Camilla.bluetongue@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Camilla Lawson at Camilla.bluetongue@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated.(SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model's margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.
There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of much more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. I am appalled that these odours are predicted to possibly continue if Stage 3 is approved. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods. (Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Camilla Lawson 147 Rochford St, Erskineville NSW 2043, Australia

This email was sent by Camilla Lawson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Camilla provided an email address (Camilla.bluetongue@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Camilla Lawson at Camilla.bluetongue@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS shows, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur.. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated.(SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.
During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Additionally publications made by westconnex are misleading and also state falsehoods.

Yours sincerely, Marcus Pethurst 553/221 Sydney Park Rd, Erskineville NSW 2043, Australia
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed; so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of much more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. I am appalled that these odours are predicted to possibly continue if Stage 3 is approved. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as
it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a
determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly
worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for
residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged
periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on
residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative
impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of
residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on
the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the
provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever
impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up
with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in
accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have
raised.

Yours sincerely, Sam Millar 76 Dickson St, Newtown NSW 2042, Australia

This email was sent by Sam Millar via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to
contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the
FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Sam provided an email
address (millarsam@hotmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sam Millar at millarsam@hotmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-
base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of much more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. I am appalled that these odours are predicted to possibly continue if Stage 3 is approved. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So we will have to put up with the exhaust from the tunnels and the additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as
it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a
determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly
worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for
residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged
periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on
residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative
impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of
residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on
the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the
 provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that ever
impact will be managed by a ‘plan’.

Tollways encourage car dependency which has proven poor health impacts. All citizens should have the option of
affordable public transport options. Despite its massive cost, Westconnex including Stage 3 will push many citizens
who cannot afford tolls onto congested local roads. The EIS fails to explain why more than $7 billion has not been
invested in public transport rather than a tollway.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up
with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in
accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have
raised.

Yours sincerely, Maria Soria 9 Edith Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

This email was sent by Maria Soria via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Maria provided an email address (mariasoria919@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Maria Soria at mariasoria919@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents’ lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.
I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be disregarded.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated. (SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.

I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.
During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods. (Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for “meaningful” consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Angela Padovan 300 Concord Rd, Concord West NSW 2138, Australia

This email was sent by Angela Padovan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Angela provided an email address (panz-@hotmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Angela Padovan at panz-@hotmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased. I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Norbert Lambert

This email was sent by Norbert Lambert via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Norbert provided an email address (take2zimbo@yahoo.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Norbert Lambert at take2zimbo@yahoo.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

The construction of roads in global cities is in decline. Car primacy is an old way of thinking, our cities need to for people. We can be smarter, we can use our existing road assets better through time flexible road pricing, maximising the efficiency of the road system.

This road had avoided public scrutiny yet spends public money. Time savings are a mirage and will quickly evaporate. we will find ourselves here again within a decade

This email was sent by Campbell Young via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Campbell provided an email address (campbellyoung60@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Campbell Young at campbellyoung60@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application. Below are only three of my objections:

- Stage 3 will do nothing to solve Sydney's transport problems. The Anzac Bridge and its approaches are already clogged at peak time.
- Unfiltered pollution stacks will have deleterious effects on the health of residents in the Rozelle area, especially schoolchildren.
- Taxpayers are footing the bill for this project (with no proper community consultation) and the costs keep mounting. Next they will be told they are paying Dan Murphy compensation.

Yours sincerely,

Lyn Collingwood
3 Leichhardt Ave, Glebe NSW 2037, Australia
SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents’ lives are damaged.

The EIS is based on an indicative design and has insufficient detail for the impacts to be properly assessed and addressed, and the public consultation has been woefully inadequate.

The EIS states ‘the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.’ The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. As a parent of young children, I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that “No ventilation shafts will be built near any school.” in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The economic basis for this project is the approval of further toll roads. Throughout the EIS there are references to the f6 and Northern beaches Link; it is assumed that these toll roads will, in fact, be built. The issue with this is that the impacts set out in the EIS rely upon them being built – that is, traffic will lessen once they are built. However, there is no certainty this will occur. Any references to these toll roads, in the context of impacts from this project, need therefore to be removed.

The comparative economic, social and environmental impacts of investment in Westconnex over comprehensive public transport to achieve equivalent outcomes for equivalent population groups have not been investigated adequately. Long term consequences have not been adequately investigated and demonstrated.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.
I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely, Kath Vaughan-Davies 4 Edna St, Lilyfield NSW 2040, Australia

This email was sent by Kath Vaughan-Davies via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Kath provided an email address (kathvau@hotmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kath Vaughan-Davies at kathvau@hotmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

Yours sincerely, Rob Price 24 Wallace Street Ashfield

This email was sent by Rob Price via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Rob provided an email address (rob.n.price@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rob Price at rob.n.price@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html
Attention: Director, Transport Assessments Planning Services Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

application number SSI 7485 – WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I am writing in response to the EIS for the M4-M5 WestConnex Link. I strongly oppose the project. Specifically, I oppose:

Lack of filtration and visual impact of the ventilation stacks: It is unacceptable to propose unfiltered stacks for the Rozelle Rail Yards and Victoria Road near Terry Street (and indeed for the entire WestConnex project) given the lack of data on the cumulative impacts on air quality and proximity of these stacks to homes, schools, preschools and aged care facilities. All ventilation facilities must be fully filtered and have real-time monitoring. This is critical given Rozelle is already one of Sydney’s most polluted areas. The cumulative impact of increased air pollution from general traffic and the White Bay Cruise Ship terminal including carcinogenic particulates would create significant and life threatening health conditions for our community.

Devastating impact of construction: we have significant concerns including with regard to noise, dust, traffic and parking around all construction sites and the lack of respite for residents. Appropriate respite periods must be provided and construction should be limited to 7am-7pm to enable residents to sleep.

Construction and operational traffic around the Rozelle interchange: this will seriously impact residential amenity, pedestrian and cycle safety and the ability of residents to park.

The significant increase of traffic on Anzac Bridge and The Crescent: Anzac Bridge and The Crescent are already at capacity.

Need to ensure on-going access to King George Park at all times during any construction and operation of the M4-M5 Iron Cove link

I am also concerned about: Pollution

Michelle Beider
michelbeider@mac.com
Attention: Director, Transport Assessments
Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

application number SSI 7485 – WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I am writing in response to the EIS for the M4-M5 WestConnex Link. I strongly oppose the project. Specifically, I oppose:

Lack of filtration and visual impact of the ventilation stacks: It is unacceptable to propose unfiltered stacks for the Rozelle Rail Yards and Victoria Road near Terry Street (and indeed for the entire WestConnex project) given the lack of data on the cumulative impacts on air quality and proximity of these stacks to homes, schools, preschools and aged care facilities. All ventilation facilities must be fully filtered and have real-time monitoring. This is critical given Rozelle is already one of Sydney’s most polluted areas. The cumulative impact of increased air pollution from general traffic and the White Bay Cruise Ship terminal including carcinogenic particulates would create significant and life threatening health conditions for our community.

Devastating impact of construction: we have significant concerns including with regard to noise, dust, traffic and parking around all construction sites and the lack of respite for residents. Appropriate respite periods must be provided and construction should be limited to 7am-7pm to enable residents to sleep.

Construction and operational traffic around the Rozelle interchange: this will seriously impact residential amenity, pedestrian and cycle safety and the ability of residents to park.

The significant increase of traffic on Anzac Bridge and The Crescent: Anzac Bridge and The Crescent are already at capacity.

Need to ensure on-going access to King George Park at all times during any construction and operation of the M4-M5 Iron Cove link

I am also concerned about:

\[ \text{Noise, air} \]

\[ \text{Signature} \quad 14/10/17 \]
Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the EIS for WestConnex M4-M5 Link. I oppose the project and outline my major concerns below, especially those related to Rozelle Public School (the School) as a sensitive receptor.

Air pollution caused by the ventilation shafts

WestConnex plans unfiltered tunnel ventilation shafts of undetermined heights: one approximately 200m northwest and three others about 600m south of the School. There is not enough detail or evidence of analysis at the moment to enable me to determine the impact to the children at the School. Please provide the following:

- An analysis of current traffic volumes at 9am, noon and 3pm on Victoria Road adjacent to the school, and projected traffic analysis for school days both on Victoria Road adjacent to the School, and for both a tolled and toll-free Iron Cove Link tunnel adjacent to the School, at 9am, noon and 3pm, by diesel and non-diesel engine type,
- Evidence of current air pollution levels at the School from 9am, noon and 3pm for all school days in the past year, and the projected levels of air pollution at the School post-construction at 9am, noon and 3pm on day one, year one, year five and year ten, including carcinogenic diesel particulates, PM 2.5 particulates, and any other relevant measurement,
- Details of the prevailing wind and other relevant weather conditions at the School for each day in the past year,
- The final design of the 4 ventilation shafts proposed for Rozelle, including the height, diameter, façade and exact location, and a commitment that all ventilation shafts in Rozelle will be filtered for PM2.5,

Impacts of construction

Four to five years of construction works is planned, including work at Wellington Street which is adjacent to the School, constructing the Iron Cove Link tunnel portals on Victoria Road about 250m from the School, with tunnelling work (and activities to support tunnelling) scheduled for 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

I am very concerned that this will mean our children (as well as local residents) will be negatively impacted in some way by worsened air quality, loud noise and untenable vibration during this time - potentially the rest of their entire primary school education - during the entire time that our children are present on school grounds or at home and for a significant part of their lives.

Please provide a construction plan to include specific commitments and plans to:

- Minimise the short-term and long-term impact of construction children's physical and mental health, brain development, stress levels, sleep and naps, and the impact on those with pre-existing lung and heart conditions,
Impacts to physical and mental health after construction

- Identify and mitigate all short-term and long-term impacts of prolonged exposure to all known air pollutants associated with traffic on sensitive receptors as those identified in Appendix K figure 6-4 are insufficient.

Road user and pedestrian safety during construction and operation

There isn't enough traffic management detail to ensure the safety for the children at the School both during construction and operation. Please provide the following:

- A traffic risk mitigation plan concerning all roads and footpaths within 500m of the construction area, including but not limited to Victoria Road, Wellington Street, Merton Street and Darling Street for road users and pedestrians, including buses, pedestrians and cyclists during construction due to temporary road arrangements or the closeness of construction activities to normal traffic,
- Details of traffic modelling concerning all roads and footpaths within 500m of the construction area, including but not limited to Victoria Road, Wellington Street, Merton Street and Darling Street which minimises risks to safety for road users, including buses, pedestrians and cyclists during operation whilst the Iron Cove Link is toll-free, and if the Iron Cove Link is tolled in future, including any possible rat runs created by toll-avoiding road users,
- A traffic plan to maximise our children's health and safety and ability to walk to and participate in important School events, such as the School cross country and athletics carnival, normally held at King George's Park, and the School swim carnival at Drummoyne pool,
- Details of the impacts on bus routes and stops, and cycle paths and footpaths within 500m of construction, including but not limited to Victoria Road during construction and operation,
- Details on access to King George's Park and the Bay Run by road users, cyclists and pedestrians during construction and operation.

Other major concerns I have include:

Safety - trucks accessing all roads around schools!

For the sake of our community, our families, and our children, I hope you will be able to consider and address these important concerns.

Yours Sincerely,

Signature:

I allow / do not allow for my personal details to be published.

I have not made a reportable political donation over $1000 in the past 2 years.

Name: Richard Lynn
Address: 19 Catherine St, Rozelle
Email: richo1ynn@gmail.com
application number SSI 7485 – WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I am writing in response to the EIS for the M4-M5 WestConnex Link. I strongly oppose the project. Specifically, I oppose:

Lack of filtration and visual impact of the ventilation stacks: It is unacceptable to propose unfiltered stacks for the Rozelle Rail Yards and Victoria Road near Terry Street (and indeed for the entire WestConnex project) given the lack of data on the cumulative impacts on air quality and proximity of these stacks to homes, schools, preschools and aged care facilities. All ventilation facilities must be fully filtered and have real-time monitoring. This is critical given Rozelle is already one of Sydney’s most polluted areas. The cumulative impact of increased air pollution from general traffic and the White Bay Cruise Ship terminal including carcinogenic particulates would create significant and life threatening health conditions for our community.

Devastating impact of construction: we have significant concerns including with regard to noise, dust, traffic and parking around all construction sites and the lack of respite for residents. Appropriate respite periods must be provided and construction should be limited to 7am-7pm to enable residents to sleep.

Construction and operational traffic around the Rozelle interchange: this will seriously impact residential amenity, pedestrian and cycle safety and the ability of residents to park.

The significant increase of traffic on Anzac Bridge and The Crescent: Anzac Bridge and The Crescent are already at capacity.

Need to ensure on-going access to King George Park at all times during any construction and operation of the M4-M5 Iron Cove link

I am also concerned about: Dust

Guillaume
Ras Tefos
application number SSI 7485 – WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I am writing in response to the EIS for the M4-M5 WestConnex Link. I strongly oppose the project. Specifically, I oppose:

**Lack of filtration and visual impact of the ventilation stacks:** It is unacceptable to propose unfiltered stacks for the Rozelle Rail Yards and Victoria Road near Terry Street (and indeed for the entire WestConnex project) given the lack of data on the cumulative impacts on air quality and proximity of these stacks to homes, schools, preschools and aged care facilities. All ventilation facilities must be fully filtered and have real-time monitoring. This is critical given Rozelle is already one of Sydney’s most polluted areas. The cumulative impact of increased air pollution from general traffic and the White Bay Cruise Ship terminal including carcinogenic particulates would create significant and life threatening health conditions for our community.

**Devastating impact of construction:** we have significant concerns including with regard to noise, dust, traffic and parking around all construction sites and the lack of respite for residents. Appropriate respite periods must be provided and construction should be limited to 7am-7pm to enable residents to sleep.

**Construction and operational traffic around the Rozelle interchange:** this will seriously impact residential amenity, pedestrian and cycle safety and the ability of residents to park.

**The significant increase of traffic on Anzac Bridge and The Crescent:** Anzac Bridge and The Crescent are already at capacity.

**Need to ensure on-going access to King George Park at all times during any construction and operation of the M4-M5 Iron Cove link**

I am also concerned about:

I am concerned about the handling of pollution and its effects on my family. Increasing roads increases traffic.

[Signature]

angus.bean@design.com
application number SSI 7485 – WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I am writing in response to the EIS for the M4-M5 WestConnex Link. I strongly oppose the project. Specifically, I oppose:

**Lack of filtration and visual impact of the ventilation stacks:** It is unacceptable to propose unfiltered stacks for the Rozelle Rail Yards and Victoria Road near Terry Street (and indeed for the entire WestConnex project) given the lack of data on the cumulative impacts on air quality and proximity of these stacks to homes, schools, preschools and aged care facilities. All ventilation facilities must be fully filtered and have real-time monitoring. This is critical given Rozelle is already one of Sydney’s most polluted areas. The cumulative impact of increased air pollution from general traffic and the White Bay Cruise Ship terminal including carcinogenic particulates would create significant and life threatening health conditions for our community.

**Devastating impact of construction:** we have significant concerns including with regard to noise, dust, traffic and parking around all construction sites and the lack of respite for residents. Appropriate respite periods must be provided and construction should be limited to 7am-7pm to enable residents to sleep.

**Construction and operational traffic around the Rozelle interchange:** this will seriously impact residential amenity, pedestrian and cycle safety and the ability of residents to park.

**The significant increase of traffic on Anzac Bridge and The Crescent:** Anzac Bridge and The Crescent are already at capacity.

**Need to ensure on-going access to King George Park at all times during any construction and operation of the M4-M5 Iron Cove link**

I am also concerned about:

Traffic

inspiredwardrobe@gmail.com
EIS Submission for WestConnex M4-M5 Link (Application Number SSI 16 7485)

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the EIS for WestConnex M4-M5 Link. I oppose the project and outline my major concerns below, especially those related to Rozelle Public School (the School) as a sensitive receptor.

Air pollution caused by the ventilation shafts

WestConnex plans unfiltered tunnel ventilation shafts of undetermined heights: one approximately 200m northwest and three others about 600m south of the School. There is not enough detail or evidence of analysis at the moment to enable me to determine the impact to the children at the School. Please provide the following:

- An analysis of current traffic volumes at 9am, noon and 3pm on Victoria Road adjacent to the school, and projected traffic analysis for school days both on Victoria Road adjacent to the School, and for both a tolled and toll-free Iron Cove Link tunnel adjacent to the School, at 9am, noon and 3pm, by diesel and non-diesel engine type,
- Evidence of current air pollution levels at the School from 9am, noon and 3pm for all school days in the past year, and the projected levels of air pollution at the School post-construction at 9am, noon and 3pm on day one, year one, year five and year ten, including carcinogenic diesel particulates, PM 2.5 particulates, and any other relevant measurement,
- Details of the prevailing wind and other relevant weather conditions at the School for each day in the past year,
- The final design of the 4 ventilation shafts proposed for Rozelle, including the height, diameter, façade and exact location, and a commitment that all ventilation shafts in Rozelle will be filtered for PM2.5,

Impacts of construction

Four to five years of construction works is planned, including work at Wellington Street which is adjacent to the School, constructing the Iron Cove Link tunnel portals on Victoria Road about 250m from the School, with tunnelling work (and activities to support tunnelling) scheduled for 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

I am very concerned that this will mean our children (as well as local residents) will be negatively impacted in some way by worsened air quality, loud noise and untenable vibration during this time - potentially the rest of their entire primary school education - during the entire time that our children are present on school grounds or at home and for a significant part of their lives.

Please provide a construction plan to include specific commitments and plans to:

- Minimise the short-term and long-term impact of construction children's physical and mental health, brain development, stress levels, sleep and naps, and the impact on those with pre-existing lung and heart conditions,
Impacts to physical and mental health after construction

- Identify and mitigate all short-term and long-term impacts of prolonged exposure to all known air pollutants associated with traffic on sensitive receptors as those identified in Appendix K figure 6-4 are insufficient.

Road user and pedestrian safety during construction and operation

There isn't enough traffic management detail to ensure the safety for the children at the School both during construction and operation. Please provide the following:

- A traffic risk mitigation plan concerning all roads and footpaths within 500m of the construction area, including but not limited to Victoria Road, Wellington Street, Merton Street and Darling Street for road users and pedestrians, including buses, pedestrians and cyclists during construction due to temporary road arrangements or the closeness of construction activities to normal traffic,
- Details of traffic modelling concerning all roads and footpaths within 500m of the construction area, including but not limited to Victoria Road, Wellington Street, Merton Street and Darling Street which minimises risks to safety for road users, including buses, pedestrians and cyclists during operation whilst the Iron Cove Link is toll-free, and if the Iron Cove Link is tolled in future, including any possible rat runs created by toll-avoiding road users,
- A traffic plan to maximise our children's health and safety and ability to walk to and participate in important School events, such as the School cross country and athletics carnival, normally held at King George's Park, and the School swim carnival at Drummoyne pool,
- Details of the impacts on bus routes and stops, and cycle paths and footpaths within 500m of construction, including but not limited to Victoria Road during construction and operation,
- Details on access to King George's Park and the Bay Run by road users, cyclists and pedestrians during construction and operation.

Other major concerns I have include:

Very concerned about how close the smoke stacks a proposed are to Rozelle Public School as well as the dust during the building stage.

For the sake of our community, our families, and our children, I hope you will be able to consider and address these important concerns.

Yours Sincerely,

Signature:

I allow / do not allow for my personal details to be published.

I have not made a reportable political donation over $1000 in the past 2 years.

Name: Wesley Rodwell
Address: 25 Hartley Street, Rozelle.
Email: wesleyroddwell@gmail.com
application number SSI 7485 – WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I am writing in response to the EIS for the M4-M5 WestConnex Link. I strongly oppose the project. Specifically, I oppose:

Lack of filtration and visual impact of the ventilation stacks: It is unacceptable to propose unfiltered stacks for the Rozelle Rail Yards and Victoria Road near Terry Street (and indeed for the entire WestConnex project) given the lack of data on the cumulative impacts on air quality and proximity of these stacks to homes, schools, preschools and aged care facilities. All ventilation facilities must be fully filtered and have real-time monitoring. This is critical given Rozelle is already one of Sydney’s most polluted areas. The cumulative impact of increased air pollution from general traffic and the White Bay Cruise Ship terminal including carcinogenic particulates would create significant and life threatening health conditions for our community.

Devastating impact of construction: we have significant concerns including with regard to noise, dust, traffic and parking around all construction sites and the lack of respite for residents. Appropriate respite periods must be provided and construction should be limited to 7am-7pm to enable residents to sleep.

Construction and operational traffic around the Rozelle interchange: this will seriously impact residential amenity, pedestrian and cycle safety and the ability of residents to park.

The significant increase of traffic on Anzac Bridge and The Crescent: Anzac Bridge and The Crescent are already at capacity.

Need to ensure on-going access to King George Park at all times during any construction and operation of the M4-M5 Iron Cove link

I am also concerned about:

[Signatures]
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).

---

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _________________________ Email _________________________ Mobile _________________________
Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the EIS for WestConnex M4-M5 Link. I oppose the project and outline my major concerns below, especially those related to Rozelle Public School (the School) as a sensitive receptor.

### Air pollution caused by the ventilation shafts

WestConnex plans unfiltered tunnel ventilation shafts of undetermined heights: one approximately 200m northwest and three others about 600m south of the School. There is not enough detail or evidence of analysis at the moment to enable me to determine the impact to the children at the School. Please provide the following:

- **An analysis of current traffic volumes at 9am, noon and 3pm on Victoria Road adjacent to the school, and projected traffic analysis for school days both on Victoria Road adjacent to the School, and for both a tolled and toll-free Iron Cove Link tunnel adjacent to the School, at 9am, noon and 3pm, by diesel and non-diesel engine type,**
- **Evidence of current air pollution levels at the School from 9am, noon and 3pm for all school days in the past year, and the projected levels of air pollution at the School post-construction at 9am, noon and 3pm on day one, year one, year five and year ten, including carcinogenic diesel particulates, PM 2.5 particulates, and any other relevant measurement,**
- **Details of the prevailing wind and other relevant weather conditions at the School for each day in the past year,**
- **The final design of the 4 ventilation shafts proposed for Rozelle, including the height, diameter, facade and exact location, and a commitment that all ventilation shafts in Rozelle will be filtered for PM2.5,**

### Impacts of construction

Four to five years of construction works is planned, including work at Wellington Street which is adjacent to the School, constructing the Iron Cove Link tunnel portals on Victoria Road about 250m from the School, with tunnelling work (and activities to support tunnelling) scheduled for 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

I am very concerned that this will mean our children (as well as local residents) will be negatively impacted in some way by worsened air quality, loud noise and untenable vibration during this time - potentially the rest of their entire primary school education - during the entire time that our children are present on school grounds or at home and for a significant part of their lives.

Please provide a construction plan to include specific commitments and plans to:

- Minimise the short-term and long-term impact of construction children's physical and mental health, brain development, stress levels, sleep and naps, and the impact on those with pre-existing lung and heart conditions,
Impacts to physical and mental health after construction

- Identify and mitigate all short-term and long-term impacts of prolonged exposure to all known air pollutants associated with traffic on sensitive receptors as those identified in Appendix K figure 6-4 are insufficient.

Road user and pedestrian safety during construction and operation

There isn’t enough traffic management detail to ensure the safety for the children at the School both during construction and operation. Please provide the following:

- A traffic risk mitigation plan concerning all roads and footpaths within 500m of the construction area, including but not limited to Victoria Road, Wellington Street, Merton Street and Darling Street for road users and pedestrians, including buses, pedestrians and cyclists during construction due to temporary road arrangements or the closeness of construction activities to normal traffic,

- Details of traffic modelling concerning all roads and footpaths within 500m of the construction area, including but not limited to Victoria Road, Wellington Street, Merton Street and Darling Street which minimises risks to safety for road users, including buses, pedestrians and cyclists during operation whilst the Iron Cove Link is toll-free, and if the Iron Cove Link is tolled in future, including any possible rat runs created by toll-avoiding road users,

- A traffic plan to maximise our children’s health and safety and ability to walk to and participate in important School events, such as the School cross country and athletics carnival, normally held at King George’s Park, and the School swim carnival at Drummoyne pool,

- Details of the impacts on bus routes and stops, and cycle paths and footpaths within 500m of construction, including but not limited to Victoria Road during construction and operation,

- Details on access to King George’s Park and the Bay Run by road users, cyclists and pedestrians during construction and operation.

Other major concerns I have include:

- All of the above. This is madness - we need to protect our children and citizens

For the sake of our community, our families, and our children, I hope you will be able to consider and address these important concerns.

Yours Sincerely,

Signature:

I allow / do not allow for my personal details to be published.

I have not made a reportable political donation over $1000 in the past 2 years.

Name: 
Address: 
Email: 
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Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16_7485.

SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below. NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the EIS. NSW Planning must reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged.

The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

The idiocy of this project is there for all to see. We need good public transport systems not more roads.

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. That it will kill only 1 child per year according to your statistics.

The EIS states, there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes. Children and the elderly are most at risk of lung ailments. The Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, that "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school." in his electorate. The same should be applied in all areas of Sydney and the government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks. WHY ARE THEY UNFILTERED?

With four unfiltered emissions stacks in Rozelle, two in Haberfield (one each for the M4East and New M5) and two in St Peters, along with a large number of exit portals, residents of these area will suffer greatly from direct exposure to poisonous diesel particulates.

This is negligent when you consider that the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic.

I object to the indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange. Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it. This EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed.

The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street would greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased if Stage 3 were ever completed. It states that Stage 3 would do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area, in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at peak times. Even the EIS recognises that this would have a negative impact on the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through local streets.

I object to the use of Darley Rd, Leichhardt as a dive site. The site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. As the EIS acknowledges and anyone who have...
driven there knows, this route is already congested at peak hours. The intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the taxpayer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. With the Premier having now been referred to ICAC over the lease extension granted over this site, it is very clear that there has been a lack of transparency in the dealings with this site. THE PREMIER NEEDS TO RETHINK WHY SHE SIGNED OFF ON THIS.

The noise and air quality studies are completely dependent on the accuracy of the traffic analysis and assumptions. If the traffic analysis is flawed, so too are the air and noise studies and local road traffic impacts. Only last week Citi financial analysts in a report to their large investors were of the view that the traffic predictions contained were unlikely to be achievable. An EIS based on inaccurate traffic analysis cannot be approved.

The inadequate traffic analysis shows that even if this tollway and all other proposed tollways are completed, the St Peters Interchange and Frederick Street in Ashfield will be considerably more congested in 2033 if the project goes ahead.

We are also concerned that the traffic figures relied upon in the EIS are simply not reliable. AECOM, the company responsible for this EIS, has a well-documented record of wrongly predicting traffic. Already there are reports that the traffic for all stages of WestConnex has been overestimated and construction costs underestimated.(SMH ‘Pressure builds on government to sweeten WestConnex sale’ 5/10/2017)

Reductions of volumes of traffic on Parramatta Rd, King Georges Road or the existing M5 are asserted but the model which projects these effects is not provided for scrutiny or independent assessment. The model’s margin for error is not stated. The rest of the benefits all depend on the asserted traffic reductions generating improved travel times and better bus services or freight movement etc. So far the experience of the growth of traffic on Parramatta Rd in response to the re-imposition of tolls on the widened section of the M4 gives us leave to doubt these touted benefits.

There is reference in the EIS to the WestConnex Road Traffic Model version 2.3 (WRTM v2.3), a strategic traffic model that has been used in the traffic analysis. This model was developed by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services who have constantly pushed a motorway agenda to the disadvantage of the development of more public transport. There is insufficient explanation of the nature of the model, where it can be accessed and what function it plays in the analysis. There is no clear explanation of how the assumptions that underpin the WRTM have changed between EIS stages. Since so much else in the EIS including noise and air quality predictions are dependent on this forecasting, the lack of transparency makes it difficult for the EIS to be subject to independent critique.

When measuring the impacts in the EIS, it is important to bear in mind the mismanagement of the project to date and residents have little confidence that any measures set out in the approval document will, in fact, be complied with. During 2017 residents in St Peters have been subject to appalling odours which have damaged the health of some community members and damaged the quality of life of many more. SMC has failed to comply with the environmental protection licence that it was granted as part of previous approvals. NSW Planning has shown that it does not have the powers to enforce compliance. In this situation conditions are meaningless. I am appalled that there is a significant risk that these odours would continue if Stage 3 is approved. I would strongly object to the NSW EPA granting a license for this project on the basis of this application and with no clear plan for how contamination would be controlled. No community should be treated in this manner.

The Environmental Impact Statement for Stage 3 admits that the traffic around St Peters will be worse when both stages are completed. So the community would have to put up with the exhaust from tunnels and additional car emissions from the traffic. Car emissions are known to shorten the lives of those who live within half a kilometre of a busy roadway. Diesel exhaust from trucks is classed as a carcinogen.
I am also concerned that Haberfield and Ashfield residents are being given the apparent choice of two construction plans, Option A or Option B, both of which will have severe impacts on the community. In fact the EIS hints at other options that have not been fully disclosed.

During the Stage one consultation phase, residents were repeatedly told that after construction of the M4 East, there would be no more above ground construction in Haberfield. It now appears that they were misled. SMC is already preparing its Preferred Infrastructure Report which will include its final choice of option. I demand that this report be made public as soon as it is filed with NSW Planning and that residents be given a right to consultation on the actual plan before a determination on this EIS application is made by NSW Planning.

There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to seriously research the current impacts on residents, measure what the cumulative impacts would be or make suggestions that would mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

The EIS identifies a significant risk of leaks of contaminated water into Rozelle Bay and Alexandria Canal. Such risks to health of Sydney's waterways is not acceptable to me. The Sydney Motorway Corporation through its conduct at St Peters has shown that it cannot be trusted to manage contamination risks.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation. Hundreds of residents within the proposed project zone were not even notified of feedback sessions. Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from the Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures, light on detail, which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a 'plan'.

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is tokenistic at best. The City of Sydney came up with a well thought out alternative plan and this has been ignored in the EIS.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, publish, my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Our house is directly affected, with no more than passing information about the possible damage to our house (as apparently other houses already affected by the Westconex are told it is their own problem and was not caused by tunnelling under/around their house). How deep are the tunnels going to be under our house.

Why do they need to affect our lives for 5 years with 24hr/7 day a week tunnelling with subsequent traffic issues.

We have lived here for 40 years and could see us living here until we could no longer. I no longer feel comfortable in our own house and dread the future. We need public transport not this madness.

Yours sincerely,
application number SSI 7485 – WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I am writing in response to the EIS for the M4-M5 WestConnex Link. I strongly oppose the project. Specifically, I oppose:

Lack of filtration and visual impact of the ventilation stacks: It is unacceptable to propose unfiltered stacks for the Rozelle Rail Yards and Victoria Road near Terry Street (and indeed for the entire WestConnex project) given the lack of data on the cumulative impacts on air quality and proximity of these stacks to homes, schools, preschools and aged care facilities. All ventilation facilities must be fully filtered and have real-time monitoring. This is critical given Rozelle is already one of Sydney’s most polluted areas. The cumulative impact of increased air pollution from general traffic and the White Bay Cruise Ship terminal including carcinogenic particulates would create significant and life threatening health conditions for our community.

Devastating impact of construction: we have significant concerns including with regard to noise, dust, traffic and parking around all construction sites and the lack of respite for residents. Appropriate respite periods must be provided and construction should be limited to 7am-7pm to enable residents to sleep.

Construction and operational traffic around the Rozelle interchange: this will seriously impact residential amenity, pedestrian and cycle safety and the ability of residents to park.

The significant increase of traffic on Anzac Bridge and The Crescent: Anzac Bridge and The Crescent are already at capacity.

Need to ensure on-going access to King George Park at all times during any construction and operation of the M4-M5 Iron Cove link

I am also concerned about:

All of the above, we need public transport more than tunnels.
worried about noise, subsidence, air pollution.

Sincerely,

[Handwritten signature]

[Address]

[Application number]

[Location and date]