

**INQUIRY INTO IMPACT OF THE WESTCONNEX
PROJECT**

Name: Name suppressed

Date Received: 24 June 2018

Partially
Confidential

Hi, the following was submitted when Westconnex asked for submissions prior to finalisation of the Haberfield to St Peters link. When the outcome of that decision was announced, including 'all' submissions, I could not find my own. How many more objections were overlooked. The objection submitted is below:

Hi, I was alarmed to learn that a tunnel is being considered to connect Haberfield and St Peters running under high density, old housing in the Camperdown/Newtown area. I live on Albert St Newtown and a twin tunnels with 4 lanes each threaten to reach the boundary of my property (if not directly under). I have planes landing overhead courtesy of the 3rd runway (the initial proposal for the 3rd runway was further to the east as well), I have plane noise from the north/south runway at the front of my property, I have a train corridor at the end of the street and now you wish to put a tunnel under my house with ventilation stacks pouring out fine particle pollution. Where is there any evidence of equality of burden in your proposition? You could run the tunnel under Camperdown Memorial Park or Sydney University to minimise the impact on individuals but you have chosen the cheaper and shorter option tunnelling through shale instead of sandstone. The houses in this area were built in the 1880s - the possibility for structural damage to the houses is significant if you start tunnelling through shale beneath the houses. Furthermore, your proposal seems to dump more traffic on already congested streets - whatever time is saved as a result of the new motorway will be lost negotiating the congested roads between the tunnel exits and the city (for those going to the city). I note as well that it is, and has been, very difficult to find maps of the exact location of your tunnel. A recent map showed the tunnel running between Probert and Chelmsford streets in Newtown and yet, the location of your drill sites would indicate that the tunnel is planned well to the east of the map location - a straight line between your Rowley St and Lennox St drill sites would suggest a tunnel path between Chelmsford and Baltic. The initial proposal for the road indicated a road length to .1 of a kilometre - it seems WestConnex has always known of the location of the road. Please provide me with detailed information on ALL drill sites for the proposed tunnel. There was a map of drill sites in my area but this is no longer available. It appears that anything which may raise concern and objection on your website is distinctly more difficult to access than artists' impressions and general pie in the sky. Your recent communication shows people overwhelmingly opposed to the project and decidedly calling for more public transport instead of roads and cars so, why are you persisting? Please radically revise your plan before it is too late. Regards, Domenic Brigandi. In addition to the above objections, I would like to bring to attention the fact that Liberty St Camperdown was once earmarked as an above ground corridor for a major link road. Many of the houses bordering the road were owned by the RTA (I have been informed). Prior to finalisation of the Westconnex project, these houses were sold off at the peak of the Sydney property boom, then a tunnel proposed under properties a distance from the designated properties. The RTA probably purchased those properties at a great price because they were potentially earmarked for roadwork, they removed the earmark, sold at high price and foisted the burden of road works on unwitting others well away from the area designated. The fact that the tunnel under Camperdown and Newtown is still indicated on your maps by two tiny lines (each equating to about 2 cars in width when each of the 2 tunnels is proposed to be 4 lanes wide) is misleading and indicative of the underhandedness of the entire Westconnex project. I have been to cities like Taipei and Tehran where complex metro systems were installed in busy and working cities with minimal disruption to the population. These metro systems carry great volumes of passengers and have somehow managed to be financially viable in both Iran and Taiwan (with low prices). How is it they can manage what we cannot? You could put metro tunnels under existing principal roads effectively causing little disruption to residents and you would take traffic off the road and cut travel times. There is no future in road transportation for a city growing at the rate Sydney is growing. You could even put metro lines under the existing rail network and sell off the land where the rail lines currently lie - you would probably be able to fund the entire project through the land value. More roads seems to be the least sensible option for a sustainable transportation network for the future. Why are we considering them? Regards,