



NSW GOVERNMENT
Department of Planning

Office of the Director General

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
COMMITTEES**

23 DEC 2005

DGC05/2602

RECEIVED

Ms Rachel Simpson
Director
Joint Select Committee
Parliament House
Macquarie Street
Sydney NSW 2000


Dear Ms Simpson

I refer to your letter concerning amendments to the transcript of evidence the Department gave at the Inquiry into the Cross City Tunnel on Wednesday 7 December 2005.

I have reviewed the transcript and marked some corrections as you have requested. Marked up copy is attached.

The answers to the 6 questions taken on notice at the Inquiry are also attached.

Yours sincerely


Sam Haddad
Director General

23/12/2005.

Questions on Notice- Cross City Tunnel Inquiry

1. Can you explain the road user benefit cost analysis and what it takes into consideration?

A cost-benefit analysis was undertaken by the RTA and documented in the EIS and Supplementary EIS. The purpose of this analysis was to provide an account of the economic costs and benefits that would arise from the proposal. The costs were attributed to land, capital, operating and maintenance costs. The benefits were attributed to time savings (road user, public transport user and pedestrian), operating cost savings, accident risk, noise effects, air pollution and greenhouse gas effects, pedestrian and other amenity effects, parking, property and development impacts.

2. Was the [ventilation tunnel] subject to an exhibition period?

Yes. The ventilation tunnel proposed by the RTA, was in the Preferred Activity Report which was publicly available exhibited from 25 November 2002 to 31 January 2003.

3. When you evaluated the project, I understand that there was an option to build light rail to the University of New South Wales that would have had a similar effect on the cross-city traffic flow as the tunnel would have, is that correct?

One of the five options examined in the EIS was a priority public transport corridor extending from West Ryde to Edgecliff and Maroubra and Randwick (including the University of NSW). The mode of public transport to be implemented along this corridor was not identified in the EIS. However, the Department's assessment must focus on the merits of the proposal as submitted for approval by the RTA, in this case the Cross City Tunnel. This is a statutory requirement.

4. Can you show [the Committee] the [strategic] rail plans that you had as an alternative to this car plan?

The EIS prepared by RTA identified rail plans and other public transport options which were considered by the Department and are identified in Table 4.2 of the EIS.

5. [How long was the consultation period for the Environmental Impact Statements prepared by the RTA?]

The EIS for the original proposal was exhibited from the 2 August to 6 October, 2000. The Supplementary EIS for the modified proposal was exhibited from the 1 August to 31 August, 2002.

The Director General's requirements for the preparation for each EIS stipulated that the RTA must consult with the community. This had been extensively undertaken in addition to the public exhibition period.

6. Will the Department of Planning propose any rail or light rail options for Sydney?

The Department of Planning is not a proponent for rail or any other infrastructure projects. However, the Department takes an active role in strategic transport planning by working closely with other government agencies to set the strategic and planning framework, identify and develop transport routes and options, including those related to rail. Much of the Department's current work is encapsulated in the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy.