10th December, 2018

Submission regarding the Western Harbour and Northern Beaches Tunnel Proposals

Dear Mr Doug Parris/ RMS,

I write on behalf of the Cammeray Public School Parents and Citizen Association (CPS P&C) regarding the proposed Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link and associated works in our area. Our school community has undertaken an extensive review of the proposed projects and the potential impacts on the school and it's catchment in response to parent concerns and queries.

In response to these, the P&C Committee undertook a review of the Beaches Link and Gore Hill Freeway Connection and the Western Harbour Tunnel and Warringah Freeway Upgrade Scoping Reports (RMS website; October 2017), as well as the Proposed Reference Design (July 2018) and subsequent updates, to ascertain the risks and concerns specific to our school community.

As you are aware, our school catchment area covers a wide-span that includes Cammeray and Naremburn, as well as many families residing in Crows Nest, Northbridge, Artarmon and Willoughby. Our review encompassed both the school area itself and the impact to parents and children within our catchment zone. Based on its findings, the P&C Committee compiled a series of questions pertaining to the proposed tunnel projects which were submitted to The Premier on 25th June 2018. We met with The Premier and discussed some of our concerns particularly around a lack of consultation in Cammeray / Naremburn and risks for our children and families. Subsequently the first public consultation sessions were held in Northbridge and Cammeray and the RMS attended our P&C Meeting. Whilst we appreciate that these meetings were arranged it was disappointing that some of the most significantly impacted areas were left until the last minute to be consulted with and only after several requests.

Following these consultations and extensive review of the project, with input from independent technical experts, the Cammeray Public School P&C committee voted to object to both projects. The details and well considered basis for our objections are explained below.

Basis for Objection Summary

In summary, the basis for our objection is the risk to children and families living in the vicinity of the tunnel routes which includes Cammeray Public School. The route of the tunnels follows 31 schools and 30 pre-school and presents a significant risk for children both during and after construction. Our school has approximately 900 primary school pupils, 70 of whom have severe asthma requiring an asthma management plan. The route chosen puts health and the environment at risk as it moves through an old landfill and quarry site in a residential area, places thousands of diesel trucks on local roads and requires dredging and damage to the delicate marine environments in Middle Harbour. In addition, construction choices made i.e. longitudinal ventilation rather than filtration present a long term risk to health…particularly that of developing children. Numerous doctors as well as international bodies such as the World Health Organisation have provided evidence around the impact of pollution on child health and health studies to date around (shorter) non-filtered stacks have not conclusively

proven the safety of dispersing pollutants over residential areas. Given the number of sensitive receivers in the area we believe the precautionary principle should be employed and construction should not be allowed to go ahead along the planned route.

In addition, following consultation with planning experts such as Dr Michelle Ziebots we do not believe that the project will meet the stated aims of relieving congestion and in fact the evidence points toward an increase in congestion in the area due to induced demand, demand for commuter parking, rat running and toll avoidance. On a wider front we believe that this road project does not meet the aims of the State Infrastructure Strategy (which includes reallocating road space in key commuter corridors to give priority to the most productive and sustainable transport modes) and will have a negative impact on Climate Change.

The need to effectively mitigate a wide array of risk, to the satisfaction of the community, will place a significant cost on the project as will the need to compensate residential home owners for property damage in and around a very old residential areas of Sydney. The psychological impact of such a project can also not be underestimated (as evidenced during the WestConnex Inquiry), many of our families and children are already deeply affected by the prospect of the project having seen the devastating impact it has had on the families in and around the WestConnex development. The period of construction represents the whole span of a childs primary schooling, children and families have a deep need to feel that their homes and neighbourhoods are going to be safe for them to live in and the scale of these projects through residential areas suggest otherwise. Given we estimate that there are over 10 000+ school children in the area, this represents a significant impact to a generation of young Australians. The cumulative health, environment and financial costs of this project far out way any purported benefits, the technologies and modes of transport proposed are not world's best practice and alternative solutions to congestion, such as sustainable transport options. have not been considered. There has also not been a business case published o justify the projects and a GIPA request to obtain one has been refused. This does not represent transparent planning or open consultation with the public in terms of our future planning.

Detailed Objections

1. Objections due to Traffic, parking and safety during and after construction

i. The proposed construction corridors are in and under residential areas.
ii. Our school and its families will live between two major construction sites at Cammeray and Flat Rock (this includes either the baseball or bushland site as both are contained within the Flat Rock Catchment). Our school families will be impacted by 70 trucks per hour on local streets for a period of 5-6years. This is an unacceptable level of construction and large truck movements across a residential area where thousands of young children live and travel to school.
iii. Cumulative congestion from coinciding projects: The WHNBL projects will coincide with Metro Tunnelling, Over-station development, Priority Precinct Development at St Leonards, Channel 9 Development and the possible upgrade of Military Road. The cumulative impact of construction vehicles and workers on local streets in and around school children presents a significant risk to child health and welfare.
iv. Children and families who live in Naremburn and Cammeray are forced, due to zoning, to cross several busy roads (i.e. Brook St/ Flat Rock Drive and Miller St) to travel to and from school. Heavy trucks present a risk to child safety as has been seen in other projects i.e. NorthConnex and many of our children walk and ride to school unattended.
v. Truck movements and workers in and around the Cammeray and Flat rock sites will make access to much needed and used sporting fields at Cammeray Oval, Bicentennial Reserve and

St Leonards Park very difficult. Access to these fields is already very challenging, particularly during peak hour and Saturday Morning sport where private and public school families move into the same areas i.e. Shore Fields. With the highest density of schools in Australia in the area and increased living density our sports fields and roads are already under tremendous strain.

vi. The RMS traffic count stations do not show increased traffic on Spit Road and Warringah Roads over the past ten years. In fact, traffic figures have dropped considerably following the introduction of B-Line buses. We object to the fact that alternative public transport options have not been considered as part of the project given the success of B-Line buses and the apparent lack of justification for additional roads.

vii. An expected drop in local traffic was not evidenced when the Lane Cove tunnel opened and many other studies have shown that both induced demand and rat running to access tunnel ports do not deliver the expected benefit or reducing traffic on local roads.

EIS Requirements should the projects proceed:

i. That full traffic analysis be completed (including Saturday Mornings) and restrictions be placed on construction operating times and parking/movement of construction vehicles particularly during school pick up and drop off times and Saturday morning sport.

ii. During construction, how will traffic flows be managed given the likelihood of road closures and/or diversion through Cammeray, Northbridge and past the school? Will there be additional safety measures and parking/ drop off provisions for parents? Will there be extra safety measures along Brook St and at Naremburn bus stops to ensure safe transport of children.

iii. How will safe passage of school children and families be guaranteed during construction? How will regulations be enforced, and complaints be handled? What has been learnt from the WestConnex project and what will be done differently in and around homes and schools?

iv. A full analysis of the spoil capacity at the Flat Rock/ Baseball Diamond site needs to be completed. At the rate of drilling (24/7) it does not seem possible that spoil can be stored during a long weekend, for example, necessitating out of hours haulage along residential streets. We do not believe that option A and B are viable sites based on the limitation of haulage hours and a lack of capacity to store spoil safely.

v. How will approvals be given to take contaminated spoil across the harbour bridge when this is not permitted? Will contaminated soil then be moved via local streets? How will the safety of children and residents be guaranteed?

2. Objections based on Loss of Green Space and Amenity

i. We object to the loss and impact of the project on scarce and much needed green space. The project will require and/or impact several of our local parklands (Flat Rock, Artarmon Oval, Tunks Park, Cammeray Park). Our students and community need clean, green space both during and after construction

ii. The dam at Cammeray Golf Course will be removed. This puts local parks at greater risk during drought conditions as the dam waters several of our sports fields including Tunks and St Leonards Parks.

iii. Silica Dust is a known Carcinogen as are diesel fumes, it is unacceptable to introduce these risks into and around environments where thousands of children play sport. Of particular concern is the enormous construction site next to the Tennis Club/ Cammeray Oval and the haulage of potentially contaminated material via diesel trucks at Flat Rock. This has the potential of flooding the valley with diesel fumes and risks introducing contaminants along the route. Our children play sport at Bicentennial Reserve, use Willoughby Leisure Centre, Flat

Rock and Tunks Park for sporting and leisure activities along with thousands of others. Placing this kind of construction anywhere in the vicinity is an unacceptable risk given that the community can attest to asbestos being dumped at the landfill site and heavy metal contamination of the soil has been found due to the old quarrying activities across the area. In addition, an old refrigeration factory was located at Flat Rock and there is a risk of disturbing refrigerants buried there.

iv. Our children use Flat Rock bush site as an educational and recreational area. Any clearance of trees or contamination of the bush further downstream is unacceptable to the community. Flat Rock is a precious and rare wildlife corridor which supports hundreds of bird and insect species as well as native and threatened species such as the Powerful Owl, Wallabies and Echidnas. As a key Wildlife corridor and a major catchment disturbance of one part of the ecosystem risks the whole.

v. We object to construction taking place at either option A or Option B at Flat Rock (or anywhere in the vicinity) due to the impact on precious bushland, contamination risks downstream and a loss of green space/ sporting facilities. Should this project proceed an alternative construction site in the Artarmon Industrial Area or a change of route along commercial corridors should be sought. Using a very old/ previously unregulated tip site in the heart of a residential community presents an unacceptable risk to human health as we have seen during the St Peter's construction. This should not be repeated, and alternative routes and sites need to be found.

EIS Requirements should the projects proceed:

i. Given the use of several local parklands (Flat Rock, Artarmon Oval, Cammeray Park), how will our students and community's need for clean, green space be accommodated during the five to six year life span of the projects? What alternative fields away from the risks of construction can be offered given the density and overuse of sports fields in the area?

ii. Should alternative fields not be found how will dust control and diesel fumes be monitored and safe limits enforced, particularly outside business hours when our children are playing sport? How will Tunks Park, Cammeray Park, the Tennis Club and Artarmon Reserve be safe for our school sporting activities?

iii. How will potentially toxic dust (silica and chemical contaminants) from construction, spoil and preparation activities be effectively controlled to ensure safety? What dust control techniques will be used and can they be guaranteed effective to 100% as a very small amount of asbestos is needed to cause harm?

iv. How will green spaces be rehabilitated following construction?

v. Will land acquired for construction and spoil sites be returned to the community as green space?

vi. Please provide detail of agreements with local councils and sporting bodies regarding the use of the dust mitigation shed as a sporting facility…..this has not been the subject of consultation with the local community and parents will not want either the bush being disturbed or a shed being converted for sport which was used for toxic dust mitigation.

3. Objections due to Noise

i. WHO rates noise pollution as second only to air pollution in terms of impact on human health. Given the topology of the foreshore areas it is understood that noise pollution will be a very significant issue for residents. We object to the project due to the impact of excessive noise pollution and the experience of residents with regard to how noise travels in the area (e.g. the school bell can be heard at Naremburn and sport whistles and boat noises travel up the valley)
ii. Works anywhere along the Flat Rock Catchment will likely echo noise along the valley, equally Middle Harbour is a known echo chamber. Construction of the Coffer Dams has been confirmed by engineers and the RMS as a considerably noisy operation.
iii. During the WestConnex Inquiry noise has been a substantial long term issue for residents and school children particularly during night works. Given the need to cart spoil across the harbour bridge and the peak hour congestion, it appears likely that night works and spoil haulage will be required through highly residential areas.
iv. Again, the choice of route through residential, foreshore areas has increased the likelihood of sensitive receivers being impact. A route along commercial corridors or construction in industrial areas would go some way to mitigating this risk and protect children from the very significant impacts of noise pollution.

EIS Requirements should the projects proceed:

v. Noise has been a key issue for WestConnex and NorthConnex residents. How will noise from construction, trucks and preparations sites be managed and effectively monitored, given the topology of the foreshore area which traps and echoes sound?
vi. Will blasting be used for tunnel construction? If so, where and when?
vii. Please detail the consequence for contractors where noise pollution controls are broken. Will trucks be allowed to idle in residential streets or near the school?
viii. Please explain why alternate (less residential) construction corridors have not been considered, so that sleep of residents is protected.
ix. How will children and families be supported to cope with the stress of significant noise pollution?

4. Objections due to Water and Land Contamination Risks

i. We object to the project as there is a significant potential for disturbing toxic materials in the neighbourhood such as asbestos, chemical leachate and odours which may affect the health and safety of our families. Other communities have experienced unbearable odour issues coming from a disturbed tip site and the EPA was unable to effectively intervene other than to litigate after the fact. Due to a lack of detail in scoping documents it appears that the risks associated with running the construction corridor through the old tip site at Naremburn have not been fully assessed as part of route selection.
ii. Middle Harbour is known to contain Acid Sulphate soils which if disturbed can release toxins into the waterways and surrounding areas.
iii. Toxic Dust from construction sites and haulage risk contamination of waterways, bush and homes.
iv. Contaminated spoil will need to be barged or carted through local residential streets and waterways furthering the risks of land and water contamination.
v. The dam at Cammeray Golf Course will be removed and construction activities may create contamination of the water course through the golf course, Primrose Park and out to Middle Harbour.

EIS Requirements should the projects proceed:

vi. How will potentially toxic dust from construction be managed to ensure schools, homes, personal items, sporting groups and travel corridors (i.e. our school children) are not impacted from the transport and storage of spoil throughout residential areas?

vii. Will a detailed environmental assessment of the Flat Rock Creek watercourse and surrounding environment be conducted, accounting for the area's high level of community use, E2 conservation status, history, and its links to many recreational areas, including Artarmon Reserve, Bicentennial Reserve, Halstrom Park and Tunks Park?

viii. If Cammeray Golf Course (and surrounds), what protections will be put in place to protect sensitive historical and botanical environs downstream? Will Cammeray Park and the Tennis Club be safe for our children to use due to dust and heavy vehicle traffic issues?

ix. How will flood risk be managed given the disruption to several watercourses which run down to foreshore areas?

x. What is the period of works at Middle Harbour? Will toxic spoil be dried out and transported through residential areas? How long will the rehabilitation of the park and waterways take before they can be used again? How will the school and residents be notified of unacceptable water quality at Northbridge Baths?

5. Objections based on increased Pollution Dispersion in the area

i. The Advisory Committee on Tunnel Air Quality July 2014 report stated that the "greatest impacts from a stack occur some distance from the stack (ie 600-1200km). Cammeray Public School sits within 1.2kms of the 2 proposed stacks at Cammeray and the additional stack at Artarmon. Cammeray sits at elevation above the 2 proposed Cammeray stacks in North/ North Easterly direction (the most common wind direction in Sydney according to the Bureau of Meterology) putting the school at increased risk of being negatively impacted by air pollution.

ii. The tunnels proposed are longer than previous tunnels built in Sydney and collect and then disperse pollution from a point source which is placed in the range of 11 schools at Cammeray and 1 at Artarmon. This represents a high proportion of sensitive receivers who's development may be irreparably impacted by daily dosing of pollutants.

iii. The Advisory Committee on Tunnel Air Quality (July 2014) stated that air dispersion modelling performed well in areas of simple terrain however "In areas where terrain is more complicated model predictions can be more uncertain" Given the difficult topology of the area it would appear that modelling is uncertain and that monitoring and epidemiological data, rather than modelling, should be relied upon to provide scientific certainty.

iv. Little actual data has been provided to date to substantiate the claim that dispersion of unfiltered pollution is safe and many assumptions are made within the modelling data and updates provided by the RMS. These include that:

    i. Background air quality is good compared to other countries: WHO states that data should not be compared across cities as many countries monitor in congested areas whereas we do not. Our closest permanent monitor at Lindfield does not comply with Australian Standards. It is concerning that results from this monitor was used in conjunction with the Prospect monitor to establish background data for the NorthConnex project. In addition, these monitors do not measure PM2.5 and further modelling calculations were needed to estimate predicted PM2.5 levels. There

appears to be a great number of estimations built into the modelling process which does not engender community confidence.

ii. Background air quality is good: we have a significant number of exceedances per month and RMS have stated at consultations that the local background data is not yet known (temporary monitor in Rhodes Ave, Naremburn) It is concerning that assertions are being made that the proposed stack dispersion is safe when we do not yet know our background level and whether we have the capacity to take on additional pollution (assuming that induced demand increases car usage over time).

iii. Local traffic volumes will decrease and therefore any additional pollution load will be undetectable: this assumption has not been born out by other projects and expert advice regarding induced demand indicates that traffic volumes locally will not decrease. Please refer to Dr Michele Ziebots submission to WestConnex Inquiry. It also seems to contradict RMS own data which shows trips rates at a higher level than they currently are based on RMS traffic monitors. This would indicate that planners are predicting increased car journeys and therefore increased pollution overtime.

iv. Australia's fleet is getting cleaner: whilst new car standards are improving we have one of the oldest fleets in the world and uptake of diesel cars is increasing. Impacts on our school and the wider school community will be seen in this and the next generation of children at least. We have a responsibility to those generations to care for their health as we transition to cleaner transport models. The EPA also states that at least 1/3 of particulate matter is generated from non-fuel sources such as tyres and the road surface which indicates that an increase in cars and roads will increase pollution over time regardless of cleaner fuel sources.

v. The world Health Organisation and other reputable scientific bodies have stated increasingly that PM2.5 has a health impact at any concentration. The World Health Organisation also warns against using standards as "safety limits" as health impacts are seen at any dose. Encouraging car usage through residential areas and dispersing PM2.5 over a wider area does not seem consistent with this advice and, in fact, appears to be ignoring it. Mixing a dangerous particle with clean air does not render that particle safe.

vi. Dispersing harmful pollutants over a wide area amounts to involuntary exposure. As parents we naturally conduct our own risk assessment when purchasing a home or selecting a school. Parents of children with asthma, for example, are highly unlikely to select a home or school next to a six lane expressway. Whilst some low level surface pollution (200-300mtrs) may be removed from surface roads the people who will most benefit i.e. people living next to busy roads are engaging in voluntary exposure with a relatively well known level of risk. Spreading pollution out over an unsuspecting population amounts to involuntary exposure and the potential for increased risk due to the pre-existing conditions within that population.

vii. It is perceivable that emergency vents will be required due to the long span of the tunnels (as per NorthConnex) Given that the route is entirely residential in nature these vents will need to release smoke/ gases in residential areas presenting a further risk to health and again questioning the wisdom of following a heavily residential route.

viii. There is a lack of epidemiological data from comparable projects which gives the community confidence that unfiltered pollution from such long road tunnels is safe. In fact, the Lane Cove and M5 studies do not give the community confidence that the technology is safe due to the observations of a cancer cluster and increased respiratory illness. The fact that monitoring data could not correlate the observed findings to the stacks does not lead to a claim of safety and we believe more health based evidence/ research is required. Given the wide range of diseases now indisputably linked to pollution it does not seem that we have explored the

depth or breadth of health impacts in the population around stacks to confidently state that the technology is safe to use in residential areas with a high proportion of sensitive receivers.

EIS Requirements should the projects proceed:

ix. We ask that an air quality monitor be placed at the school immediately to begin gathering baseline data and that local baseline monitoring data be used in all modelling rather than monitors away from congested areas.

x. We ask that an air quality monitor be placed down in Flat Rock Gully, near children's sporting fields, and that all monitoring data be available to parents and residents in real time with alerts for high risk days, particularly for the 70+ asthmatic children who attend our school. The data should also be available retrospectively and be compiled to show hourly and 24 hourly exceedances.

xi. We ask that air quality modelling and monitoring be completed by independent experts and that the cumulative nature of all new and existing stacks in the area be considered as part of that modelling. We ask that the increased traffic figures quoted by the RMS be included in the modelling and not the real time RMS traffic monitoring figures.

xii. We ask that the Department of Health conduct a comprehensive review of all major risk factors/ diseases in populations around current stacks

xiii. The height and position of Cammeray Public School needs to be taken into consideration in the design and placement of stacks to ensure the health and safety of children (i.e. how will the risk of downwash be managed)?

xiv. We ask that controls will be placed on high polluting vehicles using the tunnel, particularly where vehicles meet delayed traffic conditions as they approach the Cammeray interchange?

xv. In the last year there have been a number of incidents where the cross-city tunnel has become blocked due to an accident. Traffic had come to a standstill in all surrounding suburbs. How will bottlenecks on the Bridge and Harbour Tunnel be managed to reduce pollution? How will emissions from accidents be controlled so as not to harm above ground residents?

xvi. We ask that a comprehensive dust and contamination management plan be drawn up and the strictest monitoring and enforcement be applied given the route through and past children and families. We ask that the EPA be granted greater powers to enforce the conditions of approval on the spot rather than waiting to litigate after the damage is done to residents and children in the area.

6. Damage and Loss of Property in our Heritage and Conservation Areas

i. We object to tunnels being built directly beneath homes, in particular homes in heritage and conservation areas.

ii. Damage and loss of property, along with uncertainty, may present both an emotional and safety risks to our students and families. The RMS have advised that acquisitions will occur but to date we have not been informed of where and how many and the acquisition process and protections for home owners has not been made clear creating unnecessary stress for families.

iii. The tunnelling will go directly under four heritage/ conservation areas where there are many original works cottages with shallow foundations sitting on clay soils at Crows Nest, Naremburn, Cammeray and Willoughby. It is not clear as to whether there was an attempt made to avoid these areas during route selection. Movement, vibration and water drawdown all have the potential to damage these properties considerably.

EIS Requirements should the projects proceed:

iv. What groundwork has been done in the Naremburn and Cammeray construction zones to prove the stability of the area suitable for heavy groundworks?
v. A loss of heritage represents loss to education and community. How will Heritage homes, buildings and sites be protected, given that many are close to the Warringah Expressway which is due to be widened or directly above tunnelling and near heavy vehicle movements?
vi. What compensation will be available to residents/ our families who experience property damage as a result of construction work and heavy vehicle movements?
vii. Where and when will acquisitions take place in the area? Will the government compensate appropriately? What is the process? Will substrate acquisition occur?
viii. Have assessors consulted with local Aboriginal, Conservation and Bush Care Groups as many sites in Flat Rock and our foreshore areas are not listed on scoping maps?
ix. Have other less historically and environmentally sensitive areas been considered for construction and staging sites?

7. Objections on the basis of Devaluation of Property and Financial Distress

i. We have been advised that property prices will be (and have been) impacted throughout the area. Will the government compensate for the financial impact to our parents?
ii. Will the RMS purchase the land underneath residential properties and compensate owners appropriately?
iii. Banks have also informed that homes in and around the construction corridors will be re-valued and assigned a high risk rating making borrowing difficult if not impossible. Given the enormous mortgage value of the area this may put families under unreasonable financial strain and lead to very serious financial outcomes should homeowners be able to sell.

8. Impact to Community

i. Lower North Shore Suburbs such as Cammeray, and in particular Naremburn, are barely mentioned in the scope documents in terms of impacts, history, culture etc.
ii. Cammeray and Naremburn have previously been poorly impacted by the building of the Warringah Expressway. It seems inequitable that the same two communities will again be impacted by road projects - this alongside the other impacts is causing a growing sense of frustration within the community.
iii. Cammeray Public School Community has been poorly consulted on this project. During our one consultation session within the scoping phase, the RMS sent a communications representative, with no technical or decision- making support. Our community was wrongly informed that spoil would not be transported through residential areas in our catchment; this is contra to the scoping documents and subsequent consultation in other locations. It was only following a meeting with The Premier that the project deadline was extended, and public consultation sessions were scheduled at the end of the consultation process in Northbridge and Cammeray. There was no public session held in Naremburn. It seems inconceivable that the most heavily impacted suburbs were the last to be consulted regarding this project and has damaged peoples view of the projects

9. Poor Cost/Benefit

i. The project cost far out ways any benefits for the CPS community and surrounding suburbs. There is no apparent benefit to our community, however we are being asked to bare significant cost as outlined above. Whilst we recognise the need to provide a solution to congestion on the Northern Beaches and Mosman, why has the Mosman / Spit corridor been ruled out given that that route would share the burden of cost with residents who stand to benefit?
ii. It does not appear that a train line was considered as part of the strategic review. Can you provide a business case that shows a road tunnel is preferable to a train line to the Northern Beaches?

10. Climate Change, Biodiversity and a World Class Future

i. Our children learn about climate change, biodiversity and the importance of caring for our planet at a primary school level. They have a good working knowledge of these topics and many children (and families) are understandably concerned that we are not practicing what we preach through these projects. Building more roads into an already congested city and increasing reliance on car travel while not providing substantive, sustainable public transport options goes against all climate change advice.
ii. Sydney and its children are ready for a world class public transport system which does not threaten our climate, the biodiversity of the few stretches of bush we have left and which provides long term transport solutions for a growing city.
iii. We do not believe, on review, that these projects represent a world class solution to congestion, nor do they respect and care for our environment or our children's health.
iv. Sustainable public transport options are needed, and we fully support a moratorium on this project while a review of alternative options is undertaken. We would support investigations into extending the metro under Military Road, A Dee Why to Chatswood trainline and/or a train line across the heads to Gosford. Each of these would address congestion without the long-term health and amenity impacts that the Western Harbour and Northern Beaches road Tunnel projects propose.

Thank you for considering these many and varied issues which concern the proposed Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link.

Yours sincerely,

Jenny Riseborough
President
Cammeray Public School P&C

&

Larissa Penn
Convenor
Cammeray Public School P&C Tunnel Committee

Further References: For a full set of references associated with this submission please go to https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/57c401_d28b5a5e41e549fc95581df9c072ce3e.pdf. Please also refer to the submissions of WEPA, NPA, STT, Anzac Park School, Dr Hugh Sampiao and Dr Ray Nassar. And also the impact map below showing schools and preschools in the area: