

I object to the Beaches Link project proceeding in its current form for the following reasons:

The community consultation has failed to meet the obligations for a project of this size.

- The Design that has been put forward differs greatly from the design that was subject to the community engagement and even includes a change to the preferred route chosen early in the project. This has resulted in residents that are now greatly impacted that during the consultation process believed that there would be minor or positive impact. The same can be said for residents in the reverse scenario, many of whom have uprooted their families and sold their houses losing hundreds of thousands of dollars in the process.
- The consultation process has been divisive where community groups have been consulted with and given assurances that effectively negated assurances given prior to other community groups. The other groups were not updated of these assurances that affect them.
- The legislation regarding community participation has been violated in several ways where residents were not informed until the EIS even though they were affected, relationships with the community were not ongoing merely reactive, there has been a lack of transparency from the design team where misleading community updates were issued with an image of a design vastly different to what was being developed and wording to suggest that indicative design subject to consultation was referring to the rehabilitation of the golf course (the consultation period had ended at that stage).
- In the Balgowlah online information session staff refused to answer any questions that were not anticipated and therefore had a "canned" response. They promised to answer all questions and include them in the FAQ's on the project web site, As I write this submission on 28 February these answers have not been published.
- The Contact function on the project web site takes up to 5 days to answer and in my case as I had asked several questions, was given a reply that they would like more time to consider because I had multiple questions. Because I have more than 1 question does not invalidate my right to receive timely responses, I will add that after I reminded the user of this I did in fact start getting answers on the 5th day after submission and all of these answers were from the same person meaning that I had been assigned a case manager.
- Residents and affected community groups downstream from Burnt Bridge creek all the way to Queenscliff and Manly beach were not sufficiently notified that the creeks flow would be reduced by a large amount and that project runoff would be sent down the creek - and they will be affected.

The impact to Burnt Bridge Creek is unacceptable.

- Reducing the base water flow by 96 percent is effectively destroying the creek, early promises from the project team leader said that the section of the creek that had not been previously rerouted would not be touched are perhaps technically true, removing the water will have a profound effect on the creek, riparian zone and wildlife - some of which are endangered.
- The impact downstream, all the way to Queenscliff lagoon, Queenscliff beach and Manly beach have not been addressed in the document and these are parts of our environment that are affected.

- I fully support the submission from Northern Beaches Council on this matter however would require that, if the option of treating the water and pumping into the creek upstream is considered, there should be assurances that areas surrounding the creek would also be maintained in their pre-tunnel condition.

The impact to Manly Dam and surrounding bushland is unacceptable.

- The EIS states that it is unable to meet the environmental obligations regarding road runoff into Manly Dam and until these obligations can be met, this section cannot be built.
- The clearing of land beside the existing ridge is not being offset in a like to like way regarding fauna and flora.

Local impacts around the construction sites have been trivialised.

- Construction vehicle movements have been summed and added to current traffic data then called insignificant. I believe that a truck stopping at a set of traffic lights and then driving up a hill cannot be compared to a car whooshing past at 80kmh especially when happening at great frequency.
- There can be no heavy truck movements in or out of the construction sites outside of normal work hours and there must be heavy penalties applied and enforced if violated.
- Compression braking cannot be used by truck movements and heavy penalties must be enforced.
- Insufficient provision has been made about construction dust that will settle on neighbouring residences properties. While containment of dust and other particulate matter from construction sites has been included, it is documented that it will not be optimal. Neighbouring residences and business must be remediated as necessary from mess caused by stirred dust from the construction site. Likewise, the proponent must accept liability for any health issues that arise from the said "dust".
- Local streets cannot accommodate work site vehicle parking and if necessary, a local permit system should be put in place and enforced.
- The after-hours work expectation is vague and also has a note stating that it would be refined during detailed construction planning stage. Prior use of the word "refined" has proved to mean "made worse", there would need to be assurances that this would not happen.
- The sound modelling used in the Noise and vibration appendix appears is extrapolated and does not take into account aspects of particular properties. in particular dispute the before levels quoted for my property in Hope street and believe that puts the data for most houses in this highly impacted street in doubt. There must be an avenue for having before noise levels assessed for individual properties that adjoin the construction site. The after construction sound levels have been found to be too low in other projects and real life examples may be more accurate as far as expectations.

Local traffic issues after construction

- The traffic modelling shows increased traffic in Condamine St, Manly Vale. The section of Condamine St from the Burnt Bridge Creek Deviation all the way to Warringah Mall already experiences serious congestion, particularly around the intersection with Kenneth Rd. There is also serious congestion in the surrounding streets that feed into this traffic namely Kenneth Rd, Roseberry St and Balgowlah Rd. The EIS does not include any strategy for dealing with this and a past proposal to remove parking along this section of road was reversed after objections from local business. There must be a solution provided as to how cars would be adequately dispersed after exiting the tunnel.
- The proposed new traffic lights on Sydney Rd near Maritimo St are very close to two sets of existing lights and will clearly be a busy intersection and signal phasing conflicts seem bound to occur especially considering that the North Balgowlah rat run via Brooks Rd does not appear to be anticipated. This could potentially lead to traffic build up in Seaforth, west of the intersection on Sydney Rd and on Wanganella St.
- The new traffic lights on Burnt Bridge Creek Deviation and the Link Rd could only just move the congestion that currently exists at the Burnt Bridge Creek Deviation/Manly Rd/Sydney Rd further north for southbound drivers. Whether that is the case or not, having traffic lights on a major road within an 80kmh zone will create a negative perception for users of the road, it will also create undue noise and local emissions for the nearby residences.
- Strategies for dealing with local rat runs have not been detailed in the EIS and this could potentially impact unsuspecting residences.

The Balgowlah portal may not even be necessary

- All published documentation has the Wakehurst Parkway and Balgowlah portals linked as though they are inseparable.
- The justification case for the Beaches Link has been heavily reliant on population growth projections. As most of the areas flagged for such development are north of the Wakehurst Parkway portal, this removes the Balgowlah portal from that justification.
- The “base” year chosen for all justification of the project was 2016. In 2017 the B Line bus services were introduced and the community has broadly accepted this initiative as a resounding success due to reduced congestion and easy, reliable travel to the city. The traffic modelling team quote traffic movement numbers across the Spit Bridge as being consistent for the period 2016 – 2020 yet anecdotally travel times have dramatically reduced since the introduction of B Line. The refusal of the project team to increment the base year after such a significant change is negligent.
- In the Balgowlah online information session, a comparison of traffic data between 2016 and 2020 was shown and although showed at least a 10% drop was claimed to be about the same. When asked if the fact that due to COVID concerns, public transport was largely abandoned due to risk and private vehicle use would have the corresponding upturn the question was ignored and the subject changed.
- No traffic modelling post B Line has been taken into consideration.
- No traffic modelling excluding the Balgowlah portal has been taken into consideration
- No traffic modelling taking into account the proposed Dee Why to Chatswood B Line link has been taken into consideration.

The EIS is not publically consumable

- This objection is due to the sheer size of the document(s) it is impossible for an affected resident to make a reasonable assessment in the given time frame. Even Northern Beaches Council – a highly resourced organisation with a vested interest had to recall employees from their Christmas holidays to study this document – working full time I will add. I am a (heavily impacted by this project) father with 3 young children and have lost an entire summer that could have been enjoyed with my wife and children. The document is filled with references to tables in other documents or many pages away in the same document, many hours have been wasted trying to re-find the original place of the reference. I understand that an EIS is a complex document and may have to be large however simple measures could have been taken to assist the public but were either deliberately or incompetently not made, these include:
 - Create a searchable HTML version of the document that could be navigated using hyperlinks.
 - Reduce verbosity by removing constantly repeated text and replacing it with a link.
 - Break the entire document into individual construction sites as that could have been reasonably anticipated to be the public's interest.

The language used in the documents are understandable by less than 50% of the population.

The public display period should be extended and the above measures should be put in place.

Parts of the EIS is written in retrospect

- When the EIS was released I immediately noticed that the tunnel route had been changed from the preferred route originally chosen without public consultation and the link road had been moved to the rear fence of my property. I immediately read the section "Project development and alternatives" and found that it had been entirely written in retrospect and there is no way of discerning the true project development timeline because it implies that all options were considered.

Conditions to be imposed before submission or approval is granted

- A transparent community consultation process should commence following for newly affected residence before planning approval is granted.
- The public exhibition end date should be extended until 21 days after the FAQs from the meeting are published. 21 days being the number of days between the Balgowlah online information session and the end of the public exhibition period.
- Residents and community groups around Burnt Bridge Creek right down to Manly Beach must be notified of the effects of reduced base level and construction site waste water, and be given a reasonable amount of time to respond.
- The Balgowlah interchange must be withdrawn from the project until a design can be made that doesn't reduce the base water level of Burnt Bridge Creek.
- The impact to downstream Burnt Bridge Creek must be properly assessed before planning approval is granted.
- All hydrology conditions made by Northern Beaches Council must be accepted.
- Measures must be put into place to ensure that no construction or road run off is to go into Manly Dam.
- There must be no heavy vehicle movements into or out of the construction site outside of regular working hours. Heavy penalties must be imposed and enforced for violation.
- There must be no compression braking used by heavy vehicles around the construction site. Heavy penalties must be imposed and enforced for violation.
- A remediation plan must be put in place for the cleaning of dust and other construction matter from properties nearby the construction site.
- There must be provision for a local parking permit to be introduced if it is found that work vehicles are parking in local streets.
- The out of hours work expectation quoted is subject to change as the detailed construction planning progresses. This is not to be adjusted to a greater amount.
- Individual properties bordering the construction site must be able to have extrapolated current sound level estimates actually measured on request where before/after difference is within 2db.
- The actual plan for management of traffic flow through Manly Vale must be revealed before submission.
- The traffic lights on Sydney Rd opposite Maritimo St must be removed.
- The traffic lights on Burnt Bridge Creek Deviation and the Link road must be removed.
- Traffic management plans for all local rat runs created must be included in the submission.
- Proper traffic modelling must be done using current traffic data and including the current B Line and future Dee Why / Chatswood data for the Tunnel without the Balgowlah portal and it should be removed or deferred if it is found to be insignificant.
- The EIS is to be withdrawn and recompiled into a publically consumable format and then placed on public exhibition for a period of time that is reasonable considering its size.
- The Project development and alternatives document is to be rewritten using factual information explaining the development and not a retrospective to justify decisions made.