

**Submission  
No 217**

**INQUIRY INTO IMPACT OF THE WESTERN HARBOUR  
TUNNEL AND BEACHES LINK**

**Name:** Mr Rudy Gyzen

**Date Received:** 18 June 2021

---

17jun2021

The Hon. Daniel Mookhey MLC  
Chair  
Public Works Committee  
NSW Legislative Council  
Parliament House  
Macquarie Street  
SYDNEY NSW 2000

[Public.Works@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Public.Works@parliament.nsw.gov.au)

<https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/committees/inquiries/Pages/inquiry-details.aspx?pk=2767#tab-submissions>

### **Submission to the Inquiry into the Impact of the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link**

Dear Members of the Public Works Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit to an inquiry regarding these troubling projects. I object to the Western Harbour Tunnel (including the Warringah Freeway Upgrade) and Beaches Link (including the Gore Hill extension) projects until such time as concerns raised here & by others are adequately addressed.

Together with my wife we have raised our 3 children in the suburb of Northbridge over the past 21 years. Daily travel occurs around the local area to shops, schools, libraries, cafes, businesses, medical clinics, gyms & sporting venues. Our dogs are walked twice daily with the afternoon walk often traversing the Flat Rock Gully bush trail. I swim at Northbridge baths & am a regular public transport user travelling to the city 4 days a week.

These activities will be adversely affected by these projects. I am dismayed with the 1960s solution mindset. I do not see how these projects support the transition to a cleaner, smarter, more functional, efficient & live-able city. I want to see Sydney transition away from our growing and unsustainable single person car journeys. I want to see bold new thinking. Dedicated cycleways. Priority public transport corridors. Renewable & sustainable living without compromising our amenity. Work and play where you live. Work from home & time of day rotating schedules. Smart sensors feeding into modelling & computerised algorithms optimising everything from solar panel directions to street lighting to people movements to marine & flora & fauna care & cultivation.

I have previously made submissions to the department of planning which I attach for your reference.

I would like to address the following terms of reference:

(a) the adequacy of the business case for the project, including the cost benefits ratio,

Once the business case is fully released to the public, a proper assessment can be done of the business case adequacy & the cost benefits ratio.

(b) the adequacy of the consideration of alternative options,

The need for the project, and its superiority over public transport alternatives must be demonstrated by way of a transparent process involving informed public engagement and consultation, noting that the EIS process has to date failed to evaluate the relative merits of public transport alternatives.

(c) the cost of the project, including the reasons for overruns

Once costings & estimates are fully released to the public a proper assessment can be done.

(d) the consideration of the governance and structure of the project including the use of a 'development partner' model

One area to certainly address - an Independent Property Impact Assessment Panel (Panel) needs to be formed before any works that have the potential to result in property impacts commence. The Panel must comprise geotechnical and engineering experts independent of the design and construction team, and is responsible for independently reviewing condition survey reports, the resolution of property damage disputes and the establishment of ongoing settlement and vibration monitoring requirements.

Properties above & in proximity to the tunnel route should be offered a free pre-construction property condition survey providing a clear record of a property's condition before work starts. Any damage sustained (including "slight" movement of 10-50mm p29 ch16) during construction (tunnelling, vibration, accidents, ground water movement) or operation (due to draw down) of the Beaches link project should be promptly addressed via the panel to the satisfaction and at no cost to the property owner.

(e) the extent to which the project is meeting the original goals of the project

My understanding of the main goals of the project: address peak hour congestion, reduce travel times, improve connections, enable faster and more reliable bus trips, improve pedestrian and cycling routes, improve safety, improve air quality, boost employment with 15k and 7.5k full time jobs, provide more choice for how we move around Greater Sydney. The EIS states these goals may take up to 15 years or more to realise. Guide to the EIS pg 13: "By 2037 you will: Save up to 38 minutes Balgowlah to Sydney CBD".

My fundamental question - can these goals be realised for less money, with less impact to the environment using alternative smart city solutions?

(f) the consultation methods and effectiveness, both with affected communities and stakeholders

During the consultation period in 2018 where the community was asked as to which side of Flat Rock Gully (FRG) should be the location for the primary tunnelling dive site for the Beaches Link. Two options were given, Site A – the Baseball Diamond on the western side of Flat Rock Drive, or Site B the regenerated bushland east of Flat Rock Drive.

Despite many submissions and a petition with over 400 resident signatures that was hand delivered to the local member Gladys Berejiklian, the weight of the baseball, netball and sporting clubs meant that Site B was chosen and the regenerated bushland was to be sacrificed.

Unfortunately, the residents and the sporting clubs were pitted against each other when in hindsight they should have worked together to insist that the dive site *not be in Flat Rock Gully at all*.

The biodiversity scoped in the EIS for Flat Rock Gully dive site is very narrow and only comments on 23 threatened species. It fails to assess the impacts on the many 100s odd species that will lose their habitat due to construction activities such as noise and loss of habitat. Council has designated this bushland as a wildlife protection area as it provides significant habitats that support a wide range of birds – particularly small birds – mammals, reptiles and frogs and therefore should not be destroyed.

A full assessment of biodiversity (not limited to threatened species) in and around Flat Rock Gully, Middle Harbour and nearby bushland should be carried out & findings shared with the community;

Should the tunnels proceed the community needs to be transparently consulted around the number, type, positioning, ongoing operation & alert reporting from air, soil, surface water, ground water & harbour water monitoring stations within the project boundaries (p73 ch16 EIS);

Breaches / exceedances of accepted guideline & community agreed air, soil, surface water, ground water & harbour benchmark measures must be made public, promptly investigated and appropriate mitigation action taken to address the underlying root cause.

(j) the impact on the environment, including marine ecosystems

Urban bushland is fast disappearing. We can no longer afford to put construction sites, with all their impacts, in remaining urban biodiversity rich areas.

The dive site in Flat Rock Gully is inappropriate due to the contamination from the historical tip site, that it is a wildlife corridor supporting a number of ecosystems, it is in a water catchment area, the dust from spoil, noise, increased traffic and truck movements that put the health and safety of residents and the children who play on the adjacent playing fields at risk.

Should the project proceed as planned, the Flat Rock Gully dive site design should at least be amended / changed to avoid the need to remove any trees. If any trees are removed additional work needs to be done before construction to provide nest boxes and rock habitats for displaced wildlife. Everything should be done so the wildlife corridor is assured during and upon project completion. The Flat Rock Gully dive site should be restored to native bushland in a superior state than at project commencement. This means undertake full bush regeneration and provide three for one tree plantings as required by the local vegetation strategy. All trees to be replanted in the affected area and not offset.

The risk of contaminants moving down from the tip site as the capping is disturbed and pockets of leachate are released has not been assessed in terms of risks to Human Health and yet the EIS acknowledges the risk of run off to surrounding waterways and Middle Harbour. The EIS acknowledges the risk of workers coming into contact with contamination but does not assess the potential of bushwalkers, sporting groups, residents etc coming into contact with contaminants

The tunnel design will result in significant draw down affecting groundwater dependent ecosystems and sensitive environment at Flat Rock Gully (Project only 2028 up to 4M p60 Ch16 EIS, Project only

2128 up to 11M p67 Ch16 EIS). The EIS estimates that the drawdown in Flat Rock reserve 21m and at Willoughby Leisure Centre 22m, resulting in water stress/death for plants and trees and potential settlement issues. Ground water predicted draw down is 28 M / 36 M at Northbridge after 100 years of operation with / without extra tunnel lining installed (2128 up to 36M p62 Ch16 EIS).

The immersed tube tunnel design & dredging plan will disturb highly contaminated Middle Harbour sea bed sediment (p26 ch16 EIS) affecting Northbridge baths, Clive park and Northbridge sailing club. We need to keep recreational water users safe (p52 Ch16 EIS).

The tunnel "drain" design means 117,000 L per day of wastewater will be flushed down Flat Rock Creek each day from both construction and operational activities. Even with filtering this water will have elevated levels of dangerous contaminants.

Should the tunnels proceed a full suite of mitigation measures to protect all the wildlife in local bushland from adverse impacts such as noise, light, traffic, changes in quality and extent of surface & ground water in Flat Rock Gully during construction & remediation of Flat Rock Gully upon project completion.

(k) the adequacy of processes for accessing and responding to noise, vibration and other impacts on residents, during construction and operationally

An Independent Property Impact Assessment Panel (Panel) needs to be formed before any works that have the potential to result in property impacts commence. The Panel must comprise geotechnical and engineering experts independent of the design and construction team, and is responsible for independently reviewing condition survey reports, the resolution of property damage disputes and the establishment of ongoing settlement and vibration monitoring requirements.

Properties above & in proximity to the tunnel route should be offered a free pre-construction property condition survey providing a clear record of a property's condition before work starts. Any damage sustained (including "slight" movement of 10-50mm p29 ch16) during construction (tunnelling, vibration, accidents, ground water movement) or operation (due to draw down) of the Beaches link project should be promptly addressed via the panel to the satisfaction and at no cost to the property owner.

The noise that will be generated from the dive site, particularly during the construction phase but also beyond particularly for houses in proximity, with noise levels ranging from 75db to 60db during extended periods up to 5 years will impact human health & well been.

Prolonged heavy truck movements for tunnel excavation along Brook Street and Flat Rock Creek Drive will impact traffic in the local area.

Thank you again for this opportunity to submit to an inquiry regarding these projects.

I am happy to have my name published.

Yours Sincerely,  
Rudy Gyzen

Northbridge 2063

Attached: Copy of my Western Harbour and Beaches Link EIS Submissions