

**Submission
No 275**

INQUIRY INTO IMPACT OF THE WESTCONNEX PROJECT

Name: Mr Martin O'Dea

Date Received: 31 August 2018

26/08/2018

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL - PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE

Inquiry into the impact of the WestConnex Project

Dear Committee members,

Thank you for the opportunity to make a public submission in regard to the Impact of the West Connex project. We outline our concerns in relation to the terms of reference.

(a) Adequacy of the Business case

Options consideration

The Business case deferred to the primary mode of transport being private vehicles, arguing that only a road network provides dispersed outcomes. However \$16Billion invested on a diverse public transport system did not seem to be investigated. Eg: Heavy rail / light rail/ Busses / supported by a network of local mini busses / on demand services and so forth could also provide a dispersed outcome.

Economic benefits not explained

The 2015 business case does not adequately explain how the largest proportion of economic benefits of travel cost savings are calculated.

Debt funding

The business case mentions debt funding based on forecast traffic toll revenue. There are very few toll roads in Sydney and other parts of Australia that have come anywhere near to matching predicted modelling. The Cross City Tunnel and Lane Cove Tunnel for example.

Urban renewal.

The business case mentioned urban renewal for Parramatta Road. While this is a beneficial outcome, the Parramatta road renewal work, (while perhaps beyond the scope of the committee) does not seem to have factored in the need for the purchase of public open space out of the released land, as none is shown on the current plans. It's all seems to be development. Equally this

excludes additional investment required in both land and construction of public facilities, from schools, hospitals to parks.

An urban amenity funding of \$200M from West Connex is completely inadequate for the population increases being forecasted. This would barely cover half the parklands in Canada Bay Council required to be upgraded to meet new demand, let alone other public infrastructure, or other suburbs.

(i) Value for Money

Covered partly in item (a). Limited options into the value of \$16B of investment alternatives were reviewed.

- \$16Billion would buy a lot of public transport / metro options / bus / mini bus options.
- Equally, \$16Billion invested in employment in Western Sydney might avoid the need to drive to the city.

(j) Any other related matter

Secrecy









A heavy shroud of secrecy has been placed over the project, making it difficult for the public to understand the implications of the project. Broad vague lines are placed on community consultation maps when in reality highly detailed design work has been undertaken to get horizontal and vertical curves alignments for roads and tunnels. More transparency would assist in the public evaluating real impacts.

Difficulty in simply downloading public information on the government websites

To get real information on the project you need to go to the Government major project website <http://www.majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au>. The website however is difficult to easily access information. The main issue is multiple downloads required to actually review documents.

For example - for landscape and visual impact you have to download eight documents to read the entire chapter. The site does not give you to opportunity to click download the chapter you want while you get a cup of tea and come back.

The implication of this is sitting at a computer and making perhaps 30 downloads. This makes it difficult and frustrating. Example screen shot below.

-  M4-M5 EIS_Vol 2G_App O Landscape and visual impact_part 1.pdf (5.515 MB)
-  M4-M5 EIS_Vol 2G_App O Landscape and visual impact_part 2.pdf (40.75 MB)
-  M4-M5 EIS_Vol 2G_App O Landscape and visual impact_part 3.pdf (40.72 MB)
-  M4-M5 EIS_Vol 2G_App O Landscape and visual impact_part 4.pdf (40.88 MB)
-  M4-M5 EIS_Vol 2G_App O Landscape and visual impact_part 5.pdf (18.54 MB)
-  M4-M5 EIS_Vol 2G_App O Landscape and visual impact_part 6.pdf (18.72 MB)
-  M4-M5 EIS_Vol 2G_App O Landscape and visual impact_part 7.pdf (18.79 MB)
-  M4-M5 EIS_Vol 2G_App O Landscape and visual impact_part 8.pdf (3.007 MB)

Loss of trust from late community consultation.

During the first rounds of consultation, it appeared that property acquisition and demolition were happening in Haberfield at the same time. This gave the impression that and contracts were being let. This suggested that detailed documentation packages which perhaps took up to a year to design and document were already finished before consultation took place.

What has happened to the goods yard heritage?

There is a hoarding sign down on City West link promoting protecting our heritage. Yet the Rozelle Goods yards have been sanitised over the last few months. It appears that rail heritage elements including the overhead gantries that are shown in the Landscape architectural renderings for Rozelle Interchange, seems to be have been demolished.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Regards, Martin O'Dea