

Tabled by Clover Moore

9 December 2005

CM

Clover Moore

Summary of Action on Cross City Tunnel

5 major submissions to each key stage of the Tunnel planning process:

1. Preliminary CCT proposal (February 1999)
2. Environmental Impact Statement (24 December 2000)
3. Preferred Activity Report (7 August 2001)
4. Supplementary EIS (2 September 2002)
5. Preferred Activity Report (16 December 2002)

At least 18 media releases seeking to get public exposure and action:

1. 5 February 1999 – Call for Cross City Tunnel to Extend Under William St
2. 12 May 1999 – Flawed Cross City tunnel Plan must be Fixed
3. 8 September 1999 – Extended CCT a Welcome Response to Community Concern
4. 20 October 1999 – Road Tunnel Air Pollution: the RTA Lies
5. 17 August 2000 – Public Display Extension Vital for Cross City Tunnel EIS
6. 13 October 2000 – Cross City Tunnel: A lot of Pain for Little Gain
7. 10 July 2001 – Cross City Tunnel Public Meeting
8. 17 October 2001 – Vigilance Needed Despite Welcome Tunnel Changes
9. 30 July 2002 – Tunnel EIS Comes up for Air
10. 27 August 2002 – Local People Pay the Price for Tunnel
11. 3 September 2002 – Revised CCT More Environmentally Damaging
12. 30 September 2002 – Local MP Backs Residents on Tunnel Action
13. 24 October 2002 – Minister Hears Bligh Anger Over Tunnel
14. 22 November 2002 – CCT Changes too Late and too Little
15. 16 December 2002 – More Needed for Acceptable Tunnel Scheme
16. 18 December 2002 – Short-sighted government Drive Corporate Tunnel Scheme
17. 22 May 2003 – Bill Challenges Culture of Secrecy
18. 19 September 2003 – Bill Challenges Culture of Secrecy.

16 newsletters over five years – almost every issue – reporting to Bligh Communities:

1. issue 23, Summer 2000/01, p3 – Cross-city Tunnel
2. issue 24, Winter 2001, p4 – Amended Cross City Tunnel
3. issue 25, Summer 2001/02, p2 – Cross City Tunnel approved
4. issue 26, Autumn 2002, p1 – Cross City Tunnel changed again
5. issue 27, Winter 2002, p3 – New Environmental Assessment for....
6. issue 28, Spring 2002, p3 – 95,000 vehicles/day into New South.....
7. issue 29, November 2002, p1 – Profits! And the Cross City Tunnel
8. issue 30, December 2002, p3 – Assessment of the CCT by Planning NSW
9. issue 31, June 2003, p3 – Monitoring Tunnel Construction
10. issue 35, July 2004, p4 – Workshop on Paddington Traffic; Tunnel Exhaust Filtration Trial?
11. issue 36, September 2004, p3 – Traffic Planning for Cross City Tunnel
12. issue 37, December 2004, p3 – Tunnelling Noise, and Traffic.....
13. issue 38, March 2005, p4 – CCT Traffic Management for Rushcutters Bay
14. issue 39, June 2005, p3 – Cross City Tunnel Opens Early
15. issue 40, September 2005, p3 – CCT: "Suck it and See" approach to local traffic access and circulation.
16. issue 41, December 2005, p1 – Cross City: A chance for Reform

Three Parliamentary Statements specifically on the issue

1. PMS: Cross City Tunnel Air Filtration (18 October 2001)
2. PMS: Cross City Tunnel (3 September 2002)
3. PMS: Cross City Tunnel (22 September 2005)



NSW Legislative Assembly Hansard

Cross-City Tunnel

Extract from NSW Legislative Assembly Hansard and Papers Tuesday 3 September 2002.

CROSS-CITY TUNNEL

Page: 4469

Ms MOORE (Bligh) [9.50 p.m.]: I call on the Government to abandon the revised cross-city tunnel scheme. Although the supplementary environmental impact statement [EIS] for the revised scheme is inadequate and incomplete, it is sufficient to show that the modified proposal is much more environmentally damaging than the proposal previously approved. I call upon the Minister for Transport, and Minister for Roads to release all financial details relating to the revised proposal to enable public scrutiny and analysis of whether funding arrangements are driving this environmentally unacceptable scheme that will increase traffic, pollution and urban blight. I understand that as a result of the proposed changes the New South Wales Government will be financially advantaged to the tune of more than \$100 million, while it appears that the preferred tenderer will benefit from proposed project changes designed to maximise toll revenue. The New South Wales public needs to know whether these profits provide an inappropriate incentive to proceed with a project designed to increase tollway usage at the expense of public benefit and improvements to transport in Sydney.

I call on the Minister for Planning to establish urgently a commission of inquiry under section 119C of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act in order to investigate fully why a more damaging scheme is being proposed to replace the previous scheme. The community has the right to expect that any revised project will improve, not worsen, the previously approved project, which had 240 conditions imposed by the Minister for Planning. The revised scheme increases unplanned-for traffic impacts on residential areas, worsens air and noise pollution, is visually degrading, impedes local traffic access and risks building integrity at the eastern portal. Revised traffic conditions at Woolloomooloo will force local residents to pay tolls to get to the harbour tunnel or to use convoluted routes to access the Harbour Bridge. This reduced local access is intended to force 7,000 vehicles per day onto the tollway—more than half the total increase in traffic predicted as a result of the new scheme.

The scheme fails to match tunnel capacity to realistic traffic volumes on congested New South Head Road, which is already congested by 72,900 vehicles a day—well beyond its nominal capacity of 60,000 vehicles per day. The Roads and Traffic Authority [RTA] proposes to add even more: 95,000 vehicles per day by 2006 and 101,000 by 2016, which is 70 per cent above capacity. The modified proposal creates a Los Angeles-style spaghetti junction of roads at the eastern portal. The Kings Cross tunnel eastern exit, cross-city tunnel eastern exit, Craigend Street, Kings Cross Road and a new ramp off Ward Avenue will merge at this point, exposing large numbers of people in this densely populated area to noise and unfiltered pollution emissions from the portal, and degrading the urban environment, the precinct's heritage and the adjacent Rushcutters Bay foreshore parkland. The changed tunnel location threatens the structural integrity of the Elan, Altair and Millennium buildings, whose owners and residents must be guaranteed that their homes will be safe. Residents whose homes were damaged by the Eastern Distributor are still waiting for repairs and compensation.

I have submitted an extensive 17-page response to the revised cross-city tunnel proposal, including 40 recommendations. My submission identified significant and fundamental environmental problems, some of which I have just outlined. Furthermore, despite dramatically increased traffic volumes, the proposal fails to expand traffic monitoring and traffic management to protect the affected surrounding suburbs of Paddington, Edgecliff, Woollahra, Darling Point, East Sydney, Rushcutters Bay and Kings Cross. The revised project increases private vehicle use at the expense of public transport and provides virtually useless cycleways and pedestrian links, despite the stated purpose of the cross-city tunnel to "return roads to public transport, bicycles and pedestrians". The proposal includes increases in current levels of traffic noise and air pollution rather than setting clear targets to reduce this pollution using achievable strategies based on world's best practice to meet those targets.

Vehicle emissions in the tunnel must be filtered to improve air quality rather than dispersed across Sydney via ventilation stacks. Less restrictive construction noise limits are proposed that would cause serious daytime disruption and night-time sleep disturbance without a regime of regular external independent noise monitoring. The proposal deletes the "landscaped lid" over the western end of the Kings Cross tunnel, which was a desirable feature of the previous scheme. The tender proposal presented by the RTA in its supplementary EIS must be rejected and an alternative conforming tender selected that complies with, or improves upon, the approved cross-city tunnel project and its 240 conditions.



3 September 2002

Revised Cross City Tunnel "More Environmentally Damaging and Hazardous"

Clover Moore, Independent Member for Bligh, has called for the Government to abandon the revised Cross City Tunnel scheme, and reveal profits to Government and the proponent that appear to be the impetus for a revised project that will subject residents to increased traffic, pollution and urban blight.

"The latest Cross City Tunnel scheme is much more environmentally damaging and hazardous than the previously approved proposal, and must not proceed," Ms Moore said.

"Compared the approved proposal, this scheme increases unplanned-for traffic impacts on residential areas; worsens air and noise pollution; is visually degrading; impedes local traffic access; and risks building integrity at the eastern portal.

"The modified proposal is based on saving the Government money and increasing the profit for the private commercial operator, to the detriment of resident and area amenity. The Government must release the project's financial details for public scrutiny and analysis.

"The community has the right to expect a tender that improves, not worsens, the previously approved project, with its 240 conditions imposed by the Minister for Planning. I call on the Minister for Planning to establish an Inquiry to investigate how a more environmentally damaging scheme replaced the previously approved project," Ms Moore said.

Ms Moore's 17-page Cross City Tunnel submission makes 40 recommendations, including:

- matching tunnel capacity to realistic traffic volumes for congested New South Head Road;
- abandoning the proposed Los Angeles-style "spaghetti" of roads at the eastern portal and improving the unpleasant and dangerous intersection above the Kings Cross Tunnel;
- expanding traffic monitoring to protect surrounding suburbs of Paddington, Edgecliff, Woollahra, Darling Point, East Sydney, Rushcutters Bay and Kings Cross;
- retaining access to the Sydney Harbour and Domain Tunnel from Woollloomooloo so that local residents are not forced to either pay tolls or use convoluted routes;
- filtering the tunnel to improve air quality, rather than dispersing pollution across Sydney;
- guaranteeing the structural integrity of homes along the tunnel route, particularly the Altair, Elan and Millennium buildings that are at serious risk;
- setting targets to reduce, rather than increase, overall traffic noise;
- setting targets to increase, rather than reduce, public transport use;
- providing usable cycleways and pedestrian links to increase cycling and walking; and
- establishing more restrictive construction noise limits, particularly at night to prevent sleep disturbance, and requiring regular, external, independent noise monitoring.

[Full submission available at www.clovermoore.com/bligh/recent]

For further information contact Clover Moore MP on 9360 3054 or 0419 245 763

m
e
d
i
a
r
e
l
e
a
s
e



13 September 2002

The Hon. Dr Andrew Refshauge
Minister for Planning
Deputy Premier
Level 31 Governor Macquarie Tower
1 Farrer Place
Sydney NSW 2000

COPY

Dear Minister

Call for Revised Cross City Tunnel Proposal to be Refused Consent and a Commission of Inquiry into the Cross City Tunnel Modified Activity

I write to urge you to refuse consent for the Roads and Traffic Authority's revised Cross City Tunnel scheme and to request that you establish a Commission of Inquiry under Section 119C of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act* in order to fully investigate why a more environmentally damaging tender for the Cross City Tunnel has been proposed to replace the previously approved project.

While the Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement for the revised Cross City Tunnel scheme is inadequate and incomplete, it is sufficient to show that the modified proposal is much more environmentally damaging than the previously approved proposal.

If the revised proposal proceeds, it will impose unacceptable and unnecessary impacts on local residents and the wider community. Compared with the approved proposal, this scheme increases unplanned-for traffic impacts on residential areas; worsens air and noise pollution; is visually degrading; impedes local traffic access; and risks building integrity at the eastern portal.

The modified proposal conflicts with Government planning policies, relating to health, air quality, public transport, environmental sustainability and quality of life (for example, *Shaping our Cities*, the planning strategy for the Greater Metropolitan Region of Sydney, Newcastle, Wollongong and the Central Coast, and *Action for Air*).

It appears that the modified proposal is driven by financial advantage for the Government and the preferred tenderer, at the expense of public benefit, the regional environment, and local amenity.

I enclose a copy of my submission, which identifies fundamental environmental problems in the revised proposal, including:

- Tunnel capacity, which is predicted to allow 95,000 vehicles per day by 2006, is not matched to realistic traffic volumes on congested New South Head Road, which is already beyond its nominal capacity of 60,000 vehicles per day.
- Revised traffic conditions at Woolloomooloo, which are designed to encourage an additional 7,000 vehicles into the tunnel unnecessarily, will force local residents to pay an extra toll to get into the Harbour tunnel or to use long, convoluted routes to access the Harbour Bridge.

(2)

- To achieve increased vehicle speed in the tunnel, a Los Angeles-style "spaghetti" of roads is proposed at the tunnel's eastern portal that will degrade the precinct's amenity and heritage, and impact on the adjacent Rushcutters Bay foreshore parkland.
- The changed tunnel route affects the structural integrity of the Elan, Altair and Millennium buildings, but detailed investigations are deferred to the design stage without any guarantees that residents' homes will be safe.
- The revised project increases private vehicle use at the expense of public transport and provides virtually useless cycleways and pedestrian links, despite the stated purpose of the Cross City Tunnel to "Return roads to public transport, bicycles and pedestrians".
- The proposal includes increases in current levels of traffic noise and air pollution, rather than clear targets to reduce pollution and achievable strategies using world's best practice to meet the targets.
- Despite increased traffic volumes, the proposal fails to expand traffic monitoring and traffic management to protect affected surrounding suburbs of Paddington, Edgecliff, Woollahra, Darling Point, East Sydney, Rushcutters Bay and Kings Cross.
- Less restrictive construction noise limits are proposed that could cause serious daytime disruption and night time sleep disturbance, without a regime of regular, external, independent noise monitoring.

Given the time, expense and effort that have gone into this major infrastructure project and its impact on high density inner city residential areas, the community has the right to expect the Roads and Traffic Authority to select a tender that improves, not worsens, the previously approved Cross City Tunnel proposal, with its 240 conditions imposed by you as Minister for Planning.

Although the Roads and Traffic Authority has not released the information needed to make a full assessment, it appears that the proposal submitted by the Cross City Motorway Consortium may be a **non-conforming tender** that has been given preference over proposals that conformed with the previously approved project.

Could you please urgently establish a Commission of Inquiry to investigate why this more environmentally damaging scheme has been put forward to replace the previously approved project, including a review of the role played by financial incentives to your Government and the preferred tenderer?

Yours sincerely



Clover Moore
Member for Bligh