

To Whom it May Concern

Western Harbour Tunnel and Warringah Freeway Upgrade

In summary I object to this project on numerous grounds, including:

- a failure to demonstrate meaningful improvements in travel times,
- a failure to consider and compare other (public transport) options without tunnels and tollways,
- misrepresentation of travel time improvements and the 30-minute City objective,
- misrepresentation of the resilience benefit when access to the Sydney CBD isn't afforded via the WHT,
- misrepresentation of the detail analysis in the glossy summaries and not taking community feedback seriously particularly around the end impacts of rat running, increased congestion on local roads and negative health impacts from the unfiltered smokestacks.

Please see below for specific, detailed objections below.

I object to this project because, according to the information in EIS Appendix F - Traffic and Transport, the improvement in travel times are negligible i.e. table 7-19 (morning peak - Warringah Freeway) states the average vehicle trip time through the network would be 5:37 with the project and 6:01 without.

I object that Transport for NSW (TfNSW) has failed to demonstrate the reasonable consideration of any other options to reduce congestion and improve travel times for the relevant communities. Specifically, I believe the following options should be considered:

1. Limiting the use of private vehicles at peak times.
2. Consider imposing "time of day" tolls Northbound on both the Harbour Tunnel and Harbour Bridge to discourage private commutes with a discount for those who reside in the North.
3. Greater dedication of capacity to public transport - in particular bus lanes - with a focus on end-to-end trip times for commuters. The WHT actually negatively impacts public transport with the removal of the bus "layover" on Warringah Freeway. This is used to manage timing of buses meaning the service will become less reliable and push people to commute privately.
4. Streamlining of the Warringah Freeway without the tunnels and tollways should be modelled and compared rather than the simplistic "either (WHT)/or (Nothing)" version presented by the EIS.

I object that an analysis hasn't been presented which clearly identifies the origins and destinations of travellers including the time of day they will travel and what their preferred mode of transport would be i.e. private v public. This type of analysis should be the basic starting point for such a Project from which we seek to optimise travel times via consideration of a raft of strategic interventions. The EIS takes the traffic volumes on 'the network' and growth as a given and proceeds from there however, by looking at the Lane Cove Tunnel and Cross City Tunnel, we know this is rarely the case. In 2007 The Lane Cove Tunnel opened to a third of the predicted traffic and AMP Capital Investors sued Parsons Brinckerhoff and Booz Allen Hamilton who were responsible for the forecasted traffic numbers.

I object to the project because it doesn't improve the transport network for the people of the Lower North Shore who are significantly impacted both during (construction impacts) and after (additional toll roads to access Sydney – Sydney's North incurs a significant cost already via toll roads compared to the Eastern and Western suburbs). There are frequent mentions of the need to

improve the resilience of the network, however there are already two crossings (Sydney Harbour Tunnel and Sydney Harbour Bridge). When accidents occur in any of these arterials access to the Sydney CBD isn't available and the only way to access the North Shore is via Public Transport hence the request to investigate this more thoroughly and invest accordingly. The proposed addition of the WHT won't help with resilience of access to the Sydney CBD.

I object that the summary information presents a 'spin' on the travel time improvements rather than what the modelling shows and what people can expect. An example is in the Executive Summary E-4 it says "journeys from Dee Why to Sydney Kingsford Smith Airport are expected to be 56 minutes faster" however this isn't shown in the analysis. Without traffic congestion that trip is currently 35-40 minutes by car. At peak time the trip is currently 75 minutes via B Line and Train. If we have a significant increase in the number of people going to the airport, then it would make more sense to focus on public transport options to get everyone there faster. If there are a small number of people who insist on travelling by car from Dee Why to the Airport at peak time, then assuming Beaches Link Tunnel is done, they could choose to use that on the Brookvale to Cammeray section and perhaps save 10 to 15 minutes. However, from that point they would travel via the Sydney Harbour Tunnel and Eastern Distributor to the airport. So those hypothetical travellers wouldn't use the WHT anyway meaning this is not a positive/reason that supports the WHT.

I object to the lack of continuity in the project documents i.e. the detail and summary / synthesis are not in agreement. For example, the detail reveals a huge amount of greenhouse gas impact from the construction and operation however the summary concludes that this is a sustainable development? Both the short and long term impacts of this project make it the exact opposite of sustainable development! ***This is not a project that Sydney needs.*** We need to reduce our greenhouse gases and switch to sustainable modes of transport. We should not be building more roads for private cars and inducing more people to enter the road systems via that mode of transport. We should be favouring public transport for the vast majority of those travelling at peak times. The NSW government is failing future generations of Australians by continuing to build projects which perpetuate this type of environmental impact.

I object to the claim in Section 7.2.2 - "Access to Sydney CBD would increase as a result of Western Harbour Tunnel, with trips from North Sydney being able to access Sydney CBD within 30 minutes by road". My current commute to the city, via public or private transport, is significantly less than 30 minutes! Encouraging people to privately commute to Sydney CBD is irresponsible in regards to climate change and makes a mockery of the "time of day" tolling on the Harbour Bridge and Harbour Tunnel which is supposedly in place to reduce congestion!

The 30-minute City is enabled by, and is co-dependent on, effective public transport rather than on travel by private car, via tunnels and tollways with parking at either end. TfNSW should be thinking of moving people around between many different community centres, not just between both ends of a new tunnel.

We should allocate main roads capacity to public transport, trades and freight, at peak time. Expansion of the public transport system should take an end-to-end journey time perspective and streamline interchanges.

I object that this project doesn't address the complex intermodal / interchange requirements within the North Sydney LGA. It focuses on vehicle / network performance and not human travel time and amenity. It suggests that a deterioration of travel experience around North Sydney can be expected. This is a prime example of the detrimental impact this project has on the North Sydney LGA! This project originates and pushes West-bound traffic down Berry Street and causes congestion problems

which will inevitably spill onto the surrounding streets as people try to “rat run”. This a particular concern given the narrow roads and residential aspect of the LGA. We need to focus on public transport for access to North Sydney and keep the private car volumes to a minimum so we can preserve and improve system outcomes for all.

I object to the proposed changes to the on/off ramps of the Warringah Freeway. In particular I object to the removal of access to the Cahill Expressway from Falcon Street reducing the Lower North Shore’s access to the City. Access to the Cahill Expressway will only be from Kirribilli pushing a significant volume of traffic into an unprepared residential area. In addition, changing Ernest St to Harbour Tunnel traffic only will push traffic onto a substantially residential street which also incorporates ANAZC Park Primary home to 1000 pupils. Ernest St will no doubt be used to avoid the congestion created in North Sydney adding to the traffic created by school drop off and the right turn into Anzac Ave. Given the lack of crossings on Ernest St to assist the school children it is inevitable that there will be a fatality here with this increased traffic.

I object that this project doesn't address the requirements and expectations of integration of travel between North Sydney and the Inner West. It focuses on 'plumbing in' to the M4-M5 road system. Due to the way the project has been sliced into pieces the Rozelle Interchange is already being built assuming the WHT will happen. I object to that approach as it favours further motorway development and also makes a mockery of this process because such large infrastructure would not be built if WHT wasn't a given.

I object that the project will not deliver any benefits during the long construction period for the North Sydney LGA. **I object** that there will be substantial disadvantages/negatives and these will fall hard on our Lower North Shore community. We want improvements now and in the 2020-2025 period.

I object that simpler, less expensive and more scalable solutions could be, and should be, pursued now however have been ignored. Shouldn't the NSW Government be capitalising on successes such as the B-Line buses?

I object on many other grounds that have been captured in the community consultation chapter and 7.3.1. Although that chapter summarises the feedback and references where in the EIS information is included, it doesn't actually address or respond to the feedback. One example being "Potential impact on local streets, rat runs, local road safety, construction traffic, impact on parking spaces, congestion, road network performance, local road connections, increased traffic, cumulative traffic impact, travel time" which had 4023 comments. All the EIS does is present information that confirms and substantiates the fears and concerns of the local community and continually suggests that solutions are yet to be defined and responsibility will fall to the contractor to do so. It is unacceptable, and irresponsible, to proceed with a project when there are so many unanswered concerns.

I object to the number of unresolved items within the EIS which have been identified as “for the contractor to resolve”. It appears this has not been handled well as part of the WestConnex where the contractor was responsible i.e. earplugs to manage significant construction noise! Should this project proceed we demand that the NSW Government be responsible for these areas in conjunction with the contractor.

I object to the smokestacks being unfiltered. The pollution from these stacks has been identified as poisonous by WHO and will be impacting an area with a significant number of children. Should these stacks operate at the same time as say, impacts from bush fire smoke, the Cammeray area will be

breathing extremely harmful, toxic air. We ask that a condition of approval for this Project be that the stacks are filtered which is considered reasonable in other 1st world countries such as the Stockholm E4 Bypass Tunnel and Hong Kong Harbour Tunnel. This seems reasonable given Gladys Berejiklian proposed the same in parliament in 2008! Should filtration be refused I object to the super stacks at Cammeray and would like to see the pollution dispersed at intervals along the tunnel.

I object to the lack of information on how the impact of noise and vibration to local residents will be handled and that this is left to the contractors. Given the significant disruption to the community and impact to children in their cognitive years it is unacceptable to go into a project with this unknown. As a condition of approval levels of impact and course of remediation/mitigation must be clearly identified and contractors held to account.

In summary the negative impact on local streets, inevitable rat running, congestion, increased traffic, etc is hugely detrimental to the North Sydney LGA with no perceivable benefits. So why should the project proceed when all those negatives are presented in detail? It shouldn't proceed!