

SUBMISSION TO REVIEW OF F3 to M7 CORRIDOR OPTION SELECTION

13 April 2005

We are landowners living at Glenorie. Our comments in regard to the above concern are as follows. The assumptions that are now being questioned by way of this review need to be looked at.

It is obvious after reading much of the documentation that Option C was not really considered worthwhile studying and that Option A was the option preferred and to be promoted.

We wish to ask that the review consider the fact that Option C should have been studied more thoroughly and should have been seen as a viable option rather than being eliminated by way of constraints that were obviously relayed to the consultants at the time of the original brief or soon after. We feel that Option C was clearly not considered to be taken seriously because of these constraints. It was assumed that the constraints were iron clad and could not be challenged.

No cost study therefore seems apparent that would show the cost analysis of the tunnel Option A or other Option A alternatives in comparison to Option C above ground which would give a better long term outcome for lesser money. However this would not suit tunnel investors and a government who seem to want to send all the traffic underground.

Option C was therefore not properly assessed for any positive and long term benefits both to the taxpayer by way of a most probable large saving in tax funds by having an Option C highway that would take the traffic North whilst at the same time relieving the congestion on Pennant Hills Road for the residents who reside there and others who live nearby. This Option C would be a choice that would provide traffic relief not as a band aid solution such as the Option A proposes to do but as a way forward to provide another northern link which is sorely needed right now to take the trucks and other vehicles off Pennant Hills Road.

We feel that Option C should be reconsidered as a legitimate alternative route North.

END OF OUR SUBMISSION