

## **INQUIRY INTO CROSS CITY TUNNEL**

Organisation: 2011 Residents Association Incorporated  
Name: Ms Wanda Jaworski  
Telephone:  
Date Received: 18/01/2006

---

Theme:

Summary

# Submission to the NSW Parliamentary Enquiry into the CCT

2011 RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION INCORPORATED

PO Box 1211 Potts Point NSW 1335.

President: Tina Newton

Secretary: Wanda Jaworski

18 January 2006

---

## **2011 RESIDENTS ACTION GROUP INC**

We are a residents action group representing the interests of residents and small businesses in the 2011 postcode. This area embraces Kings Cross, Potts Point, Elizabeth Bay and Rushcutters Bay.

The major thrust of our issues with the CCT relate to the extensive road changes in our area that have been associated with the CCT and/or purportedly related to the CCT contract.

This submission by 2011 Residents Action Group Inc (2011 RA) is focused on issues directly impacting on our daily lives.

## **GOALS OF THE CCT**

We note that the initial Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, quoted in the Roads and Traffic Authority Submission, contained the primary objectives of the Cross City Tunnel:

1. to improve the environmental quality of public spaces within Central Sydney
2. to improve the ease of access and reliability of travel within Central Sydney
3. to improve the reliability and efficiency of travel between areas east and west of Central Sydney

The road changes have led to a complete failure of objectives 2 and 3 and, somewhat more subjectively, to the failure of the first objective.

## **SUMMARY: CCT FAILS TO MEET PROJECT GOALS**

2011 Residents Action Group Inc (2011 RA) submits that:

- a) Most of these road changes have had significant negative impacts on our daily lives.
- b) The State Government entered into a deal with the private operators of the CCT designed to make it difficult for drivers from outside the City East/Darlinghurst (CED) area to transit public roads in City/City East/Darlinghurst other than by using the CCT and paying tolls.
- c) William Street Wasteland, not the Champs Elysees.
- d) Many of these road changes were not, and are not, required by the CCT contract but are initiatives of either the RTA or City of Sydney Council or both.
- e) Many of these road changes are not only unnecessary but are, in fact, counter-productive to effective and efficient traffic flows in the 2011 area.
- f) Bourke St has no bearing on the CCT and has negative outcomes for 2011 residents and businesses. We request that Bourke St be immediately re-opened to improve pedestrian safety and public access.

## **WHY CCT FAILS TO MEET PROJECT GOALS**

### **A. Negative Impact of CCT Road Closures and Traffic Modifications**

Most of the residents and businesses in 2011 reside adjacent to or within the entrances and exits of the CCT. Consequently we are not frequent users of the CCT as it starts at Rushcutters Bay and ends on the western side of the CBD. This issue is one of the fundamental flaws of the planning and implementation of the CCT. People who wish to visit City East/Darlinghurst and/or the CBD, rather than by-pass these areas, are seriously inconvenienced by the changes to roads within the 2011 area designed to force drivers into the CCT—whether they want to, or can usefully use the CCT, or not!

### **B. Social and Economic Impact of Tunnel Funnelling.**

The state government's agreement with CCT operators is designed to make it difficult for drivers from outside the City East/Darlinghurst (CED) area to transit the CED other than by using the CCT and paying tolls. This fact creates considerable inconvenience for, the residents and businesses of 2011.

This largely manifests itself in the decision to narrow William St and prevent direct access from William St to the Harbour Tunnel. The narrowing of William St has experienced growing traffic congestion as the CCT fails to attract custom. The inevitable consequence is more cars using less road creating driving delays and frustration. We are particularly concerned about the reduced access for emergency vehicles such as ambulances, fire engines and the police to the 2011 area caused by the William St narrowing. Another unfortunate side effect has been a very substantial increase in taxi fares for any travel between 2011 and the CBD.

### **C. William Street Wasteland**

William St is being re-packaged with extensive works narrowing the roads and widening the pavements and has been billed by the Carr Government and Lord Mayors Frank Sartor and Clover Moore as 'William St Boulevard'. We are asked to picture a sort of Champs Elysee with cafes and up-market shops running from the Town Hall to The Cross. The pitch sounds great but the reality is different. William St runs east/west with the tall buildings on the north side: it's almost always in shadow and is a wind tunnel. Many of residents experience this cold and wind daily as they walk to and from work in the CBD, including in a long period of sunny drought! More grey granite only enhances this bleak picture. The result is not Pissaro's Paris, but Brutalist.

Under the current plan it will be harder for customers to easily access William St businesses; if you can't park there then you can't drive there. It will be also be difficult for some businesses to stock and supply their shops with potentially disastrous effects on trade. Why, because the changes make it difficult to drive to and park around the businesses for owners and suppliers as well. The CoSC's William St Boulevard concept seems to be based on the somewhat wishful thought that exciting new businesses will open on William St in the hope that they can draw people to them and that exercise averse Sydneysiders will walk 1 or 2 kilometres to get there. More a 'leap of faith' than a viable concept as William St is growing notable for it's rapidly increasing lack of viable retail businesses. Since 1924 William Street has functioned as a specialist car display centre. The buildings from the 1924–29 period were all designed for this display. For the past sixty years this has also serviced Sydney's tourist economy. What is wrong with this economic model? We have heard no objectors. The William St Boulevard is at considerable risk of becoming the William St Wasteland!

### **D) Re-Open Public Roads Closed by RTA/City of Sydney**

Many of these road changes were not, and are not, required by the CCT contract but are initiatives of either the RTA or City of Sydney Council or both. The road closures and redirections surrounding William St have been associated with the CCT contract with State government. A recent review of contracts has revealed that much of this is not correct. A number of the roads closures/redirections

around William St appear to have been initiated by the CoSC and/or the RTA rather than required by CCT contractual fiat.

**E) Many of these road changes are not only unnecessary but are, in fact, counter-productive to effective and efficient traffic flows in the 2011 and 2010 area.**

In particular, it is no longer possible to access the harbour tunnel by turning right from William St. Residents are now required to travel up William St to Kings Cross then down Darlinghurst Rd, along Macleay St and into Cowper Wharf Rd where there is a one lane access to the harbour tunnel. This is a journey of at least three times the distance previously required to access the harbour tunnel. This is particularly irksome to 2011 residents as we already live within the CCT entrances and exits and cannot effectively use the CCT to access the harbour tunnel yet are required to 'jump through hoops' to exit our local area. We believe that this is an unfair and unnecessary imposition on 2011 residents. Once a driver has accessed William St they have already rejected the CCT option. We believe that access from William St to the Harbour tunnel for 2011 residents does not impinge upon the CCT operators toll revenues.

**F) Pointless Closure of Bourke St.**

Access to Bourke St from William St has been closed at the William Street.

This has made both travelling within the Darlinghurst precinct and travel between Darlinghurst and Woolloomooloo very difficult. It has isolated Woolloomooloo and has had the effect of turning some of the streets in Darlinghurst into 'ghost' streets. The police have advised a member of 2011 who was robbed in Liverpool St that the number of muggings in the area has risen significantly since the Bourke St closure. The closure of Bourke St has made servicing of businesses in both Bourke and William St difficult and will exacerbate the demise of already limited commerce in the area. The closure of Bourke St is not required by the CCT contract but is a CoSC and/or RTA initiative.

**G) Road changes at the Kings Cross Landbridge.**

This area encompasses the intersection of Kings Cross Rd, Craigend St, Darlinghurst Rd and Victoria St that actually forms 'Kings Cross'. The landbridge was originally created with the construction of the Kings Cross tunnel and has been expanded during the work on the CCT. Apart from physical expansion of the landbridge there are significant traffic issues relating to changes in both roads and traffic flows in this busy zone.

We are concerned about the impact of this funnelling and are alarmed and disappointed that we have been neither consulted nor notified by CoSC or RTA regarding the changes.

**a) Kings Cross Rd.**

Traffic numbers have increased strongly on Kings Cross Rd (one-way going east). We have repeatedly asked CoSC for a pedestrian crossing at the Ward Ave end of Kings Cross Rd. There are two major apartment buildings on top of the tunnel on the 'island' that is created by Kings Cross Rd and Craigend St. These two buildings have approximately 1300 residents. Crossing Kings Cross Rd is increasingly hazardous for pedestrians.

**b) Craigend St.**

There has been a huge increase in traffic on Craigend St (one-way going west) as drivers seek to avoid the CCT and/or wish to drive to the CBD rather than by-pass it. CoSC/RTA have responded by removing one lane from Craigend St, adding a traffic island, adding a cycle lane and adding parking spaces on the northern side at the Kings Cross junction. This is not a CCT contractual requirement and has created a classic bottleneck. The effect of the lane removal and the addition of parking has meant that traffic wishing to turn right and access Kings Cross Rd or Darlinghurst Rd is limited to approximately two cars per traffic light sequence. One of our members, a resident of the Altair apartment building which has its egress onto Craigend St, reports that it is routine to require

three or four sets of lights to be able to exit Craigend St and enter either Darlinghurst Rd or Kings Cross Rd.

### **c) Darlinghurst Rd.**

Darlinghurst Rd approaches the Kings Cross intersection from the south. It is a two lane one-way street with very heavy traffic flows. The left lane has recently been converted to a dedicated left-turn-only lane accessing William St. Most of the traffic in Darlinghurst Rd travels straight on into the suburb of Kings Cross staying on Darlinghurst Rd. The effect of the dedicated left turn lane has forced the majority of the traffic on Darlinghurst Rd into one lane which creates both chaos at the Kings Cross intersection as large numbers of cars try to mesh into one lane and a significant back-up of traffic going back as much as two blocks and sometimes causing gridlock in streets south of the intersection.

## **SUMMARY: CCT FAILS TO MEET MINIMUM PUBLIC INTEREST STANDARDS**

### **1. Failure to Consult**

The Government failed to inform the affected City East community the full raft of CCT-related road closures and modifications. The project failed to meet even the woeful terms of the Minister's Conditions of Consent regarding Community Consultation, as we understand it, of COA Nos 11, 12 and 13 (instructions to set up Community Liaison Groups) and COA No 288 (instructions to consult regarding trial closure of Bourke Street at William. The overriding concern is that the project has already been determined. Relying on stories in newspapers is not "consultation". Community volunteers are not the same as public and private stakeholders. Consultation merely means agreement of pre-determined outcomes. A further concern is that, in this case, at all stages public authorities and elected representatives failed to reveal the full scope of road closures and traffic restrictions associated with the project, especially after the 2002 revisions. This systemic failure or wilfulness, means that CCT CLG members serves as either apologists or unwitting patsies to the hidden 'greater project'.

(i) Volunteer Community Liaison Group members donated their goodwill, trust and resources to the project for two years. However, only those groups whose members support road closures are ongoing. The Kings Cross CLG was disbanded in July 2004. By then, it had only three members as most had resigned in frustration between July 2002 and July 2004. (See letters to CLG.) The Central CLG continues. Its members (also committee members of the ESNA group) support the broad thrust of CCT project and related road closures. At the final meeting of the Kings Cross CLG in July 2004, the Chair announced that "The community is represented on Central group. All issues concerning members of this CLG can be raised at Central CLG." A member who requested an invitation to join the Central CLG was told that "a written application for membership must be raised with Central CLG who will decide "whether they wish to expand their membership". However, these are ridiculously small and unrepresentative numbers. It is preposterous to expect that a handful of community volunteers have the resources (or inclination) to communicate with 33,000 residents.

(ii) Federal and state representatives were briefed on the scope of the project but failed to alert their constituents to the full impact of cumulative closures. In the case of the Member for Bligh, whose political career is based on a commitment to closing "local" roads to "intrusive" traffic to "protect residential amenity", a significant conflict of interest was evident and overrode her broad responsibility to report fairly and objectively. South Sydney and City of Sydney councillors (with the exception of the Lord Mayors) were, like the broad community, inadequately informed of the scope and scale of the project.

(iii) At the request of the Lord Mayor, a CCT consultant (Abigail Jeffs, Parsons Brinckerhoff) and RTA representatives met with DRAG and 2011 reps on 15 December regarding the proposed closure of Bourke Street. Although it was put that we oppose closing Bourke St, the consultant's

report was submitted to DIPNR c. 20 December 2004. Local business groups were not consulted about the CCT's 2002 modifications. We were aware from consulting The CCT Community Committee (Eastern Portal) before the meeting that there was no plan for the "widespread concentration of traffic onto New South Head Road" and Ocean Street, Edgecliff.

At the meeting we were told that Bourke Street would be subjected to a "six month trial closure". Closing Bourke Street was a fait accompli and, in fact, a "consultation report" would be presented to the Minister in the next few days. We pointed out that Bourke Street was already closed for CCT construction causing considerable business duress and hardship.

Almost as an afterthought, we were appraised of some of the CCT-related road closures and modifications in City East. Until this time, although we represented two well-informed resident action groups, we had not been approached, directly mailed or consulted about any of these changes.

Our response was to prepare a paper entitled Call For A City East Traffic Plan, 2011 Residents Association & Darlinghurst Residents (DRAG), 8 February 2005. This looked at the combined impact of CCT and City of Sydney road closures detailing our concerns about the impact of road closures. (See Attachment.) The paper was sent to the Minister for Planning, Lord Mayor, Sydney Traffic Committee, CEO City of Sydney and CEO RTA.

We received the following acknowledgements:

- (i) Parsons Brinckerhoff, 10 May 05: entitled "Dear Survey Participant: re Bourke Street Traffic management Study" thanking us for our feedback and advising of the 6 month review.
- (ii) Minister for Roads (per Parliamentary Secretary Eric Roozendaal), 22 June 05: advising that the RTA would monitor CCT traffic changes for at one and three years after the opening. It also noted "I'm advised that your organisation participated in this consultation".
- (iii) RTA per Les Wielinga Director of Motorways, August 2005: inviting us to view a copy of the Bourke Street Report process on the RTA website and advising of the 6 month review.
- (iv) Clover Moore, Lord Mayor, 22 August 05: informing us that Council had decided to review "traffic management in East Sydney precinct" in early 2006 and that after the review, council would still proceed with community consultation on a trial closure of Liverpool Street at Whitlam Square and other Road closures.

No respondent acknowledged the scope of our concerns about the impact of all combined road closures, lane closures and modifications in City East.

In December 2005 our attention drawn to the misrepresentation in the Report entitled CCT: Response to Minister's Condition of Approval No 288 (Parsons Brinckerhoff for RTA, December 2004.) We never received a copy of this misleading report, nor were we even advised of its existence in a library. We categorically deny that we were advised or were involved "consultation" at any level before the informal meeting of December 2004.

## **2. Failure to undertake Due Diligence on a Public Project**

The CCT project lacked relevant data to make an informed decision. To make an informed decisions the full impacts, both positive and negative, of the proposed closures should have been assessed. The project failed to conduct a comprehensive Traffic and Safety Study and a Study of Economic and Social Impacts

The entire project relied on existing studies. These, claim the RTA, can be augmented by further local traffic assessments and CCT "traffic monitoring" in the Ministers Conditions of Consent. We are concerned that unless these studies are undertaken, the Minister's COA does not provide a safeguard for the local community.

### Limits of Previous Studies:

(i) Eastern Distributor EIS (RTA, 1996) & Eastern Distributor Local Area Improvement Program (LAIP, RTA, 1999). The ED is a north–south project. This EIS covered a huge area of the Eastern Suburbs, from the Cahill Expressway to Rosebery. The ED removed the load on Bourke, Crown, Riley and Palmer Streets and created the opportunity to convert Crown and Bourke (to Cleveland Street) back to two-way structures and close Bourke at Taylor Square. The impact of these changes has not been assessed.

(ii) Cross City Tunnel EIS (RTA, 2000) and Cross City Tunnel SEIS (Cross City Tunnel: Altered Modified Activity – Review of Traffic and Transport Implications, RTA: Masson Wilson Twiney, 2002.) (COA No 61 and 288; Report points 15, 16, 17, 18): the 2002 modifications study was directed by the Minister “to minimize rat-runners”, that is toll-avoidance. (Condition of Approval No 288.) In 2002 Clover Moore MP called for a public inquiry into the CCT modifications. The Member for Bligh gave the following reasons: increases unplanned-for traffic impacts on residential areas; worsens air and noise pollution; visually degrading; impedes local traffic access; 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.

(iii) William and Bourke Street Traffic Management Study (Minister’s COA 288, RTA, December 2004): At the Woolloomooloo community consultation meeting (October 2004), residents forced a motion on whether people wanted Bourke Street closed. The majority voted to leave it completely open. (The misrepresentations of this study are elsewhere discussed in our submission.)

(iv) EIS for the CCT (Vol 4, Technical Paper No 8, ‘Effects on Suburbs surrounding the CBD’, pp. 69–71, 2000.) Technical Paper No 8 was written prior to these major and complicated changes: the extension of the CCT from Kings Cross to Rushcutters Bay; the proposal to close all access to Cahill Expressway including access from Sir John Young Crescent (except for 1-lane from Cowper Wharf Road); and the closing of Bourke Street. These changes affect the entire City East network. However, the COA requires monitoring only of Bourke Street (in 6 months).

The Report claims the Technical Paper justifies its claim that a City East traffic study is not needed. The Paper, in fact concludes the opposite, that management schemes are needed before considering any more changes.

### **3. What safeguard? Limits to the RTA’s Traffic Monitoring after CCT opening.**

Residents and business are concerned about monitoring business and community impacts, not just traffic counts. Indeed, the RTA only acts to monitor traffic “if traffic intrusion on these streets/ roads reasonably exceeds that predicted in the 2002 RTA Report”. If streets/roads are closed, there will be reduced traffic and thence no monitoring need be undertaken. No one is monitoring modifications and closures proposed by council.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Recommendation 1: that the road changes surrounding William St restrict normal traffic flows and restrict business, public transport, emergency services and social services. We request that they be reversed.

Recommendation 2: that the ‘ACE: Summary of Identified Traffic Concerns in Relation to Road and Traffic Flow Changes for the CCT’ is implemented as appended to the Action City East submission.

Recommendation 3: that denying direct access to the Harbour Tunnel via William St is unreasonable and unfair to local residents. We request that access to the Harbour tunnel via Sir John Young Crescent be restored.

Recommendation 4: that the closure of Bourke St has no bearing on the CCT and has negative outcomes for 2011 residents. We request that Bourke St be re-opened to improve pedestrian safety and driving access.

Recommendation 5: that a pedestrian crossing across Kings Cross Rd at the Ward Ave end of the street is an urgent priority.

Recommendation 6: 2011 submit that the road works/changes on Craigend St are unnecessary, counterproductive and not required by the CCT contract. We request that they be reversed.

Recommendation 7: that the dedication of the left hand lane in Darlinghurst Rd to left turning traffic only is unnecessary, counter-productive and not required by the CCT contract. We request that the left hand lane revert to normal traffic conditions.

Recommendation 8: that traffic calming is introduced at the intersection of McIlhona Street and Brougham Lane and an the traffic island in William off McIlhona Street is extended to stop illegal LH turns into KX tunnel caused by cars forced to avoid the traffic gridlock at the Kings Cross off-ramp. We oppose city council's solution to just remove resident parking which will only leave more room for speeding and force residents to park away from their homes and walk thru dangerous streets at night to get home.

\*Recommendation 9:

That the RTA commission a Comprehensive and independent Traffic and Safety Study into the entire region affected by CCT related road closures and modifications.

\*Recommendation 10:

That the RTA commission a Comprehensive and independent Economic Linkages Study of City East.

**Attachment:**

Call For A City East Traffic Plan, 2011 Residents Association & Darlinghurst Residents Action Group, 8 February 2005.

## CALL FOR A CITY EAST TRAFFIC PLAN

8 February 2005

### 1. STREET CLOSURES IN CITY EAST

City East covers the 2010 and 2011 postcodes. The areas of Woolloomooloo, Kings Cross, Darlinghurst and East Sydney are bounded by: College Street (east), Cowper Wharf Road (north), Neild Ave (east), Oxford Street (south).

The following closures to local streets and regional roads (by City of Sydney) and to the arterial road network (by the RTA) are proposed or have been approved:

#### 1.1. **Sydney City Council proposes closing:**

- Liverpool Street to all traffic at Whitlam Square (except emergency vehicles);
- Francis Street to all traffic at College Street;
- All traffic coming down Stanley from College can only turn left into Yurong and then proceed to William Street;
- Palmer Street exit to Oxford Street (as part of Oxford Street Upgrade).

#### 1.2. **The RTA has recently implemented or proposes closing:**

- Bourke Street closed South of William Street or permanently half closed north of William Street;
- Prohibit right turns from William St into Bourke St northbound;
- Bourke St (north of William) is now one-way running south. Driving south from Bourke St you can only turn west to the CBD<sup>1</sup>;
- Cathedral St is now one-way between Palmer and Bourke Street eastbound. The rest of Cathedral remains 2-way.<sup>2</sup>

#### 1.3. **The CCT/RTA has approval from Dept of Planning (now DIPNR) to implement these changes:**

- Stop traffic from Sir John Young Crescent from entering the Harbour Tunnel. Instead, traffic will U-turn at a single lane roundabout constructed at the intersection of Crown and Sir John Young Cresc to Macquarie Street and over the Cahill Expressway or proceed via Cathedral Street/Bourke St to Cowper Wharf Road;
- Restrict access from Cowper Wharf Road to northeast CBD. Through traffic originating east of Kings Cross would be required to use either the CCT or William St;
- Access to the Harbour Tunnel only from Cowper Wharf Roadway westbound;
- Kings Cross traffic will enter the CCT portal via a new ramp from Ward Ave (located 30 metres east of the existing Kings Cross Tunnel);

---

<sup>1</sup> The RTA wants to "improve intersection capacity on William St at Palmer St". We prefer an alternative method—changing the timing of traffic signs.

<sup>2</sup> Woolloomooloo residents opposed the RTA's "G-loop", a one-way system for William St traffic to enter the Eastern Distributor south bound, via Palmer–Cathedral–Bourke Sts.

- Reduce the number of traffic lanes in the Kings Cross Tunnel from 6 to 4. They will comprise only one general traffic lane and one transit lane westbound and two general traffic lanes eastbound.

## 2. **IMPACT OF PROPOSED CHANGES**<sup>3</sup>:

The effect of these changes would be to:

- Force locals to use a more circuitous route to the CBD or Harbour Tunnel;
- Force surface traffic trying to access the Harbour Tunnel into the CCT;
- Increase traffic into the CCT by ensuring increased “choice” of the CCT by locals.”<sup>4</sup> The RTA aims to encourage car use as a Public-Private Investment (PPI) incentive;
- Cause delays for locals exiting Woolloomooloo east of Bourke St;
- Increase traffic on Ward Ave, Kings Cross Road and Victoria Sts as well as Neild Ave, McLachlan Av and Liverpool St (Darlo) and MacDonald St;
- Concentrate traffic onto New South Head Rd (already congested by 72,900 vpd beyond its capacity of 60,000 vpd);
- Create a bigger bottleneck on Macquarie Street (from 19,800 to 26,800 vpd)<sup>5</sup>;
- Increase traffic northbound on the Bridge (+7000 from Cahill Expressway and +7840 vpd from Bradfield Highway).

## 3. **NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON CITY EAST RESIDENTS & BUSINESSES**

### 3.1. In East Sydney & Woolloomooloo

Traffic in East Sydney is now light, except for the four streets—Oxford, William, Crown, Stanley—all densely packed with residents, businesses and restaurants. These streets are heavily congested, with heavy noise and air pollution. The proposed closures are of streets with light traffic which will decrease further when the CCT opens.

Congestion on these heavily used four routes will be aggravated because:

- Traffic from the City will have to use Crown Street to access any streets between Hyde Park and Crown. There will be a single lane turn for east traffic into Crown from William;
- If Bourke Street is closed south of William, traffic cannot turn into William Street from Bourke Street. All Bourke Street traffic will travel along Crown Street or Stanley/Yurong to leave the area;
- Traffic currently using Liverpool Street to enter East Sydney will travel via Oxford Street and Crown Street;
- Traffic currently exiting from East Sydney to Oxford Street via Palmer will travel via Crown Street or Victoria Street Darlinghurst;
- Crown Street between Oxford and William Streets will be jammed during peak hours. Cars from side streets already have great difficulty turning into Crown Street;

<sup>3</sup> All quotes RTA, Cross City Tunnel: Altered Modified Activity – Review of Traffic and Transport Implications (RTA Oct 2002: Masson Wilson Twiney).

<sup>4</sup> In 1999 dollars index this is \$5 (a \$2.50 each way fee) or \$1.10 to exit at Sir John Young Crescent, Woolloomooloo to access the Harbour Tunnel.

<sup>5</sup> RTA, CCT Review, 2002, p. 17: By 2016 Macquarie St increases from 19,800 to 26,800 vpd caused by redistributed traffic unable to access the Harbour Tunnel from Sir John Young Cresc.

- The only east-west streets open in East Sydney also carry the 389 bus route;
- The 311 and 312 bus routes would be re-directed in Woolloomooloo. The 311 will be gridlocked between Cathedral and William;
- Harbour Tunnel access is by weaving via Crown or Palmer to Cathedral, then via Bourke to Cowper Wharf Road;
- Harbour Bridge access is via Macquarie Street or through the City or via the CCT;
- The increased traffic threatens the success of the Oxford and William Street upgrades.

### 3.2. In Kings Cross, Potts Point and Darlinghurst

- Traffic on Victoria Street will increase;
- Ward Ave and Craigend St will be clogged with traffic accessing the CCT;
- Traffic will increase on Darlinghurst Road, Macleay Street and Wylde Street in Kings Cross, since this will be one of the major routes for Darlinghurst and Kings Cross residents to access the Harbour tunnel;
- East Sydney traffic will use Darlinghurst Rd/Victoria Street or Darlinghurst Rd/Macleay St as an alternative to Crown Street.

## 4. CALL FOR A CITY EAST TRAFFIC PLAN

Resident groups in Kings Cross, Potts Point and Darlinghurst are therefore urging the City of Sydney Council and the Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA) to:

CITY OF SYDNEY COUNCIL

### i. **Keep local streets open**

**In 2001 City Council opposed any further road closures in East Sydney.**<sup>6</sup>

Trial openings rather than trial closures will allow pre and post traffic studies to ascertain the true traffic and transport impact of the CCT.

### ii. **Assess existing closures and ‘trial closures’ in East Sydney.**

These residents already experience difficulty in accessing their own streets. Recent closures include Forbes and Burton Streets at Taylor Square and ‘trial closing’ of sections of Forbes Street, Forbes Lane, St Peters Street and Yurong Lane.<sup>7</sup>

CITY OF SYDNEY COUNCIL & RTA

### i. **Initiate a proper traffic and transport study for City East and CDB**

**No official study has been made in this area for over 20 years!**<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Sydney City Council opposed: i. Riley St closure at Sir John Young Crescent—may divert William St traffic into City streets; threatens local road status of parkway through Cook & Phillip Park; congestion due to Palmer St intersection saturation with northbound traffic particularly in AM peak; Coach & Bus Layover in the Domain Car park depends on Riley St being open for Coach access from the City. ii. Liverpool St closure at Whitlam Square—important east-west spine the closure of which may divert traffic into Stanley St & others in Darlinghurst. For other views on proposed closures at Whitlam Sq and Francis St see: <http://www.rta.nsw.gov.au/constructionmaintenance/downloads/correspondpetitions.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Called for by resident group ESNA. See: Strategic Plan, Feb 2002, esnaweb.tripod.com

<sup>8</sup> Eastern District Planning Study-Environmental Study- East Sydney Precinct, Council of the City of Sydney, 1982 (22 years old). The only relevant local area study is ‘Eastern Distributor—Local Area Improvement Programme; Whitlam Square Local Area Traffic Study’ (RTA, 2001: Arup Transport and Planning) and the RTA’s CCT activity reviews.

The new study should undertake accurate traffic counts before and after the opening of the Cross City Tunnel (CCT) and assess the cumulative impact of current and proposed traffic modifications to City East and adjacent areas.

The impact of a 30% local population increase in the last five years also needs assessment<sup>9</sup> as does the extensive re-zonings in the South Sydney LEP (1998) to allow increased commercial activity in former residential areas.

The RTA claims the CCT impact is “generally [slightly] reduced traffic in the inner city” but notes that several major roads will have increased traffic. The new restrictions introduced in 2002 are designed to route traffic into the CCT (and increase revenue).<sup>10</sup> In 2002 Clover Moore MP opposed the CCT modifications<sup>11</sup>.

However, the RTA claims the CCT will give a widespread reduction to east-west traffic in East Sydney streets (west of Forbes).<sup>12</sup> Therefore, there are no traffic grounds to close these local roads.

**ii. Encourage use of buses and trains, and walking and cycle routes, but acknowledge a need for City East road traffic.**

Local people must travel distances for work, services, delivery as well as family, social, cultural and recreational reasons.<sup>13</sup> A strategy to discourage use of vehicles by intentionally creating road congestion is unlikely to be successful and has negative economic and social effects.

**iii. Aim for a fair traffic plan.**

The only significant east-west access from Oxford Street between the CBD to Bondi Junction is via College Street, Crown Street, Darlinghurst Road then Ocean Street.

**iv. Consult all interested and affected third parties.**

DRAG and 2011, for example, were consulted too late in the day for meaningful comment on the RTA’s proposed Bourke Street closures.<sup>14</sup>

**City East Traffic Working Group**

---

<sup>9</sup> Housing Needs Study, South Sydney City Council, August 2002.

<sup>10</sup> RTA, CCT Review, 2002, pp. 8-11: by 2016 there will be an increase in usage of 15.1% per day. This is “predominantly attributable to 40% increased usage of Sir John Young Exit portal because of restricted access from Cowper Wharf Roadway to northeast CBD”.

<sup>11</sup> Clover Moore MP, Private Members Statement, 3 September 2002. Abridged from a 17-page response to the 2002 CCT modifications, including 40 recommendations. Some summary points: local residents are forced to pay tolls to get to the Harbour Tunnel or to use convoluted routes to access the Harbour Bridge; fails to match tunnel capacity to realistic traffic volumes on New South Head Road (already congested by 72,900 vpd well beyond its nominal capacity of 60,000 vpd); creates a spaghetti junction of roads at the Eastern Portal and at the Kings Cross Tunnel eastern exit/CCT eastern exit (where Craigend Street, Kings Cross Road and a new ramp off Ward Avenue merge); increases private vehicle use at the expense of public transport; increases traffic noise and air pollution.

<sup>12</sup> RTA, CCT Review, 2002, p. 10, 13, 35.

<sup>13</sup> ABS Census 2001, 'Method of Travel to Work': 2011 postcode (1.4 sq kms, 9,529 persons) and 2010 postcode (2.1 sq kms, 12,396 persons) have a roughly equal division of travel methods between public transport (bus, train), car and walking only (comprising 80% total in 2010 and 95% in 2011).

<sup>14</sup> At the request of the Lord Mayor, a CCT consultant (Abigail Jeffs, Parsons Brinckerhoff) and RTA representatives met with DRAG and 2011 reps on 15 December. Although it was put that we oppose closing Bourke St, the consultant’s report was submitted to DIPNR c. 20 December 2004. RESNET and local business groups were not consulted about the CCT’s 2002 modifications. The CCT Community Committee (Eastern Portal) and the CCT Action Group claim there is no plan for the “widespread concentration of traffic onto New South Head Road” and Ocean Street, Edgecliff.