

Director Transport Assessments Planning Services  
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

Application: SSI 7485

Dear Director,

I write to **OBJECT** to all aspects of Modification 2 of the approved EIS Stage 3B Rozelle Interchange.

The Modification fails to maintain the standards set by the original Rozelle Interchange EIS as:

1. A **2 lane Overpass is inconsistent with the rest of the project** which was to minimise its impact on the surrounding community and environment. By having the proposed Overpass above ground, it adversely impacts the aspects and amenity of residential homes in Annandale, Rozelle and Lilyfield and the users of both Bicentennial Park, in Glebe and Easton Park, Rozelle. Increased noise and light spill from the overpass will adversely impact residents. The Overpass also destroys the integrity of the Heritage Crescent Mural.



Easton Park users current view south to Crescent intersection

2. The **integrity of the approved Greenlink** to create a shared transport link from Rozelle Rail Yards to Bicentennial Park will be decimated. The Greenlink will now be halved, linking The Rozelle Rail Yards only to the Rozelle Bay light rail station. Pedestrians and cyclists will then need to negotiate a narrow path to road level and then interact with traffic via 4 sets of lights to access Bicentennial Park instead of the current 1 pedestrian crossing. What madness is this? Putting people and traffic back on the same interactive plane!
3. As compensation for the loss of the approved Greenlink, RMS proposes an Option 4 detailed in the Modification: **a 4.5m wide Shared User Path Bridge**. This fails on all levels:
  - a. It does not provide a direct link to Bicentennial Park but drops you west of the park
  - b. It is twice as long as the current direct link which for the disabled, elderly and those with small children or prams, discriminates against them.
  - c. It is certainly not wide enough creating a 1.1 metre single file path for both north and south travelling pedestrians and cyclists.

- d. It fails to support the Inner West's "walk only" mode of travel at 32% compared with greater Sydney at 18%.
4. All consequential **negative impacts on traffic patterns** in the area as detailed throughout Modification 2, are deemed acceptable without being challenged by anyone. Where is the NSW Department of Transport in all this? How does any of this fit in with their Sydney "future proofing" plans which is about all modes of transport and creation of place rather than just cars and trucks. Why will Victoria Road have no dedicated lane to feed into on the Anzac Bridge? What do other Government departments such as State Transit and the Port Authority of NSW say, now that the issues they raised were ignored? What level of traffic chaos is RMS proposing for the area?
5. There was **no consultation** carried out by RMS for the Rozelle and Lilyfield community. This flies in the face of the standard of consultation carried out by the then Rozelle Interchange, Project Director who achieved the current approved EIS. His philosophy was to get him and his team out behind a desk and interact with those in the community that this project would impact. To explain respectfully and listen to the community's concerns and suggestions. He understood that the improved amenity of the greenspace and the Greenlink was an acknowledgement of some form of compensation to the local community of the suffering, pain and anguish they would suffer during the construction of the Rozelle Interchange. The current leadership team in the RMS clearly has no such understanding of any of these concepts.

If the building of an Overpass does in fact go ahead, then:

- **Option 2**, which is detailed in the Modification AND as originally published by the RMS in its August 2018 Western Harbour Tunnel brochure, should be adopted which maintains the commitment made by the NSW Government to provide a wide, safe and direct active transport link from the Rozelle Goods Yard to Bicentennial Park. The arguments raised by RMS that option 4 is safer for users than option 2, is illogical and self serving to justify option 4. Both options have the same issues – being stuck out over the City West Link wont help someone any more than walking along option 2. Option 4 must also be a far more expensive build (not that any figures were provided to review in the Modification) compared to Option 2.
- Landscaping solutions must be found to shield every resident and park user from the visual, light and noise impacts created by the Overpass.
- Traffic solutions must be found to all negative traffic impacts created by this Modification.

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth Johnstone