

**Submission
No 506**

INQUIRY INTO IMPACT OF THE WESTERN HARBOUR TUNNEL AND BEACHES LINK

Name: Shona McKenzie

Date Received: 12 June 2021

Dear Sir/ Madam

I wish to register an OBJECTION to the proposed Beaches Link tunnel. This objection is made under a,b,c,f,g,i,j,k,l and m of the Terms of reference

TUNNEL SURVEY AND JUSTIFICATION

It is my understanding that the tunnel proposal has progressed because of a survey undertaken over 2 years ago. I believe though that only 38 percent of the Northern beaches residents canvassed supported the proposal. This was before the 11000 page EIS was released detailing impacts and before COVID-19 and the hub and spoke public transport upgrade.

I request the assumptions for traffic used as a justification to build the tunnel be recalculated. Residents have permanently changed travel habits and more work from home now, plus those requiring city transport are now better serviced with the public transport upgrade. In addition the impacts to the Environment have been detailed in the EIS which will influence support or opposition if residents have a chance to read it!

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The impacts are large and it is difficult to comment on all aspects so I will concentrate on a few I have been made aware of.

Burnt Creek Reserve

With over 70 percent flow reduction in construction and 96 pc reduction on completion this reserve will be decimated. The unique flora and fauna will not survive including the protected flying fox sanctuary near Balgowlah. This is a well used cycle and walking trail offering an active green space for residents and a wildlife corridor. It's loss is unacceptable. Similarly Flat Rock and Tunks Park plus a section of protected bushland in Duffys Forest are severely impacted.

I request that you reconsider the impact loss of such areas will have on the quality of life of the residents. Loss is in direct contradiction of the Premiers Promise to promote active green spaces.

Vehicle impact

The residents of North Balgowlah will be impacted with dust, vibration, noise and increased vehicular traffic including heavy trucks.

-over 3000 vehicles per day across sites

-1.5 heavy vehicles every minute

-4000 homes subjected to noise in excess of acceptable levels.

Please reconsider how the already difficult to navigate residential streets will be impacted. How can this be minimised.? What will happen near schools? I note there's an increase in

hospitalisation of children at Seaforth public school forecast in the EIS possibly due to this?. It is not acceptable.

Other environmental impacts.

This area has beautiful bush land, green spaces and beaches. There is significant environmental impact on these and I ask that further consideration be given to the major impacts including

- Destruction of Burnt creek reserve as above.
- The movement of heavily contaminated sediment to Clontarf and Middle Harbour. Overseas experience has shown sediment curtains do not work!
- Discharge of over 400000 litres of contaminated water into Queenscliff lagoon resulting in health hazards for both people and animals.
- pollution of Manly Dam causing the possible extinction of rare flora and fauna and rendering it unusable for public swimming.
- loss of mountain bike trail and walking tracks.
- Pollution during construction from heavy diesel vehicular use and on completion from unfiltered exhaust stacks. Gladys Berejiklian has been quoted as saying the worlds best practice is to filter such systems.

I want future generations to be able to enjoy the unique environmental diversity of this area. These areas are under threat because of the construction and even in operational phase with the Parkway widening, lighting and run off plus air pollution for example. Why make the beaches more accessible if in the process you destroy what makes it so special?

EIS PRESENTATION

At 22 kg this Statement is difficult to get through. I note no time extension was granted to put in submissions although several parties requested this. It feels like there is a rush to close public comment before the public have had a chance to get to grips with its content! So what is it hiding?

As a supposedly impartial document presenting facts there are 2 things I have noticed to start with. Firstly the "artistic license" in the drawing of the proposed exhaust stack near Balgowlah Boys. In the picture it looks no bigger than a bus on its end whereas in reality it is 6 or 7 storeys high. This is deliberately misleading.!

Secondly there is no air quality station to be installed near Balgowlah Boys because " they don't get the Northerly wind" Why then does the BOM wind rose diagram for Balgowlah give a 5 year average of 9.3 percent Northerly and over 10 percent NNE?

I ask that the EIS be checked for **deliberately** misleading or incorrect diagrams and wording.

ECONOMICS

The cost/ benefit of this proposal does not stack up.

At 10 to 13 billion there is an estimate that only 6 will be recovered from tolls. So who will make up the difference.

Travel savings...not in the northern beaches area! Congestion during construction and with induced demand likely Congestion on operation with vehicles either trying to enter the tunnel or avoid it. The biggest post construction saving appears to be in Mosman and even that initial 10 minute time saving disappears after 3 years.

Costing in the loss of the environment as above, and the severe impacts on residents health both pre and post operation, this project does NOT MAKE SENSE FINANCIALLY.

I request that you look at the traffic demand now, post covid, that you take into account the change in public attitude to become more conscious of climate change, that you look at this in the context of things like the Premiers promise and vision to increase active green spaces and improve public transport.

In conclusion tunnel vision is not a good thing! It leads to proposed developments like this which are out of step with the community needs and values and values of Australians as a whole. It is promoting vehicular transport when public transport is now in the spotlight. It leads to the destruction of the habitat that this area is admired for in a time when the spotlight is already on Australia as a country with a high animal extinction record and a less than adequate climate policy.

I strongly object to this proposal and ask that the above submission be taken into consideration.