

## INQUIRY INTO CROSS CITY TUNNEL

Organisation: City of Sydney Residents' Network  
Name: Ms Jill Yates  
Telephone:  
Date Received: 20/01/2006

---

Theme:

Summary

Resnet (City Of Sydney Residents Network)  
GPO Box 776  
Sydney 2000

18<sup>th</sup> January 2006

Re: Enquiry into the Cross City Tunnel

Inclosed here with please find our submission for your consideration.

Yours faithfully,



Jill Yates

JSC CROSS CITY TUNNEL

20 JAN 2006

RECEIVED

Submission to the Joint Select Committee on the Cross City Tunnel

Parliament of New South Wales  
Parliament House  
Macquarie Street Sydney 2000

Attention: Rachel Simpson

ENQUIRY INTO THE CROSS CITY TUNNEL

Submission

Resnet (City of Sydney Residents Network)  
GPO Box 776  
Sydney 2000

As CBD residents it was never apparent to us how the cross city tunnel could be a benefit to us given that there was no exit or entry points to or from the CBD. It did seem to be accepted wisdom though that many thousands of cars per day would use the tunnel thereby freeing the CBD streets and our members would therefore benefit from less street traffic.

That clearly has not occurred and the street traffic is worse since the tunnel opened.

1. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Our members are concerned at the increased traffic and congestion in the CBD which effects our ability to exit the city. King Street and exits from the CBD to the East appear to be badly affected.

The traffic flow around the city has not been assisted by some of the traffic changes. There is no apparent reason why, for example, traffic has now been prevented from turning right into George Street from Park Street travelling West. This change puts additional pressure on Druit Street which is very narrow and contains considerable amount of bus traffic. All traffic from Park Street is then required to turn right into Clarence Street, once again a narrow street with quite a number of residential buildings along its length. These changes have resulted in much more traffic being on the city streets attempting to get to the destination. The redirected traffic is therefore on the roads longer.

RECOMMENDATION; that traffic travelling in a westerly direction in Park Street be again permitted to turn right in George Street.

2. TOLL

Clearly the toll on this short tunnel is proving to be a disincentive and should be reviewed. Significant good will must be restored before numbers in the tunnel increase significantly. People must be given an incentive to use it rather

than a penalty. That will probably require traffic changes at the Eastern end of the tunnel and a reduced toll.

**RECOMMENDATION;**

The toll pricing should be no higher than the harbour tunnel and should be always on a par with that tunnel in the future

Traffic changes in Woolloomooloo and Rushcutters Bay should be considered although the specifics of those changes would be better addressed by a group from the local area.

**3. CONSULTATION;**

The establishment of the community liaison groups as part of the consultation process was commendable as was the amount of material provided to those groups. Two of our members were appointed to the Darling Harbour committee. We found the construction members of the committee to be constructive and helpful in answering questions and providing information. However, the RTA representatives responses were frequently flippant, non responsive, delayed and/or evasive. It appeared that community issues were not a concern of the RTA.

Group members gave a considerable amount of time over a number of years to this committee and it appears that not all relevant information was provided to its members to allow discussion and decision making. The consultation process was too late in the whole process and did not allow meaningful the input.

**RECOMMENDATION;**

The future community liaison groups of this type be positioned earlier in the decision making process to facilitate constructive input and the possibility of committee members recommendations being adopted or at the very least considered in the decision making process. An example of better positioning is the community committee set up in relation to the quarantine station adaptive reuse proposal.

**4. FILTRATION;**

Members have sort to have the tunnel air filtered from the earliest date possible. We became even more concerned at the possible ramifications when changes were made to the plans resulting in all tunnel air being extracted at Darling Harbour. That change appeared to occur after the consent process. The placement of the stack at Darling Harbour is particularly unsuitable given the fact that it is in the midst of Darling Harbour, on the edge of the CBD, in a tourist area and at a low point in the topography. The numbers of people potentially affected by the pumping out of unfiltered air in the present location is of concern and a possible significant liability for the State government in due course.

In March 2005 it was announced by the State government that tunnel filtration would be trialled with a clear inference that that would be conducted in the

cross city tunnel. That is apparently not to occur and it is unclear whether or not that trial will be held in any tunnel in New South Wales.

**RECOMMENDATION;**

That the committee investigate and establish who will hold liability for any future health claims as a result of air contamination in Darling Harbour from the tunnel.

In tunnel filtration needs to be fitted whilst tunnel patronage is low.

Resnet supports the following recommendations of the Lord Mayor;

Tunnel toll – review of toll pricing structure and toll reduction


Comprehensive review of road changes

40 km speed limit in central Sydney

Development of an integrated transport network blueprint

Full and real public consultation

In addition to that recommendations included in the body of this document

  
JILL YATES  
PRESIDENT  
RESNET