

Submission Form



Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Proposal. Application number SSI 5132.

Name(s): GERALDINE VOS

Address: 16 COBRAN ROAD CHELTENHAM

I/we object to the Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Proposal and consider that the EIS is inadequate and does not address the full impact of this proposal. It will cause untold damage to the health of residents and to the fabric of the Beecroft Cheltenham Heritage Conservation Area. Do not approve this project, reconsider the alternatives and protect the community.

No Government Regulation of Noise and Pollution from these trains.

- The EIS does not address the impact on noise of the real potential increase in rail freight traffic beyond the current projected increase from 29 to 41 movements a day thereby avoiding the legislated need for a reassessment of noise levels.
- An independent study has shown current rail noise levels result in some 2 to 3 sleep disturbances a night where 1 is normal for reasons other than noise. Noise frequency will increase with increased traffic and is unacceptable.
- The same study showed that highest noise levels peaks occurred between 10pm and 6am, seven days a week.
- Sleep disturbance is recognised as a significant stress factor which impairs health and wellbeing.
- The EIS does not address the known health issues in the community resulting from increased rail freight namely coal dust from uncovered wagons and diesel particulate matter, a known carcinogen.
- These private freight operators should be subjected to legislative controls which protect the community and be forced to upgrade to modern high powered trains which would avoid the need for this third track.

Heritage

- There has been inadequate assessment of the project's impact on the fabric of the Beecroft Cheltenham Heritage Conservation Area (HCA).
- The plan given for Beecroft Railway station Precinct is vague. The relationship to the trees, playground and original 1895 platform located south of the present station is not shown. A fourth track is shown on the eastern side. The plan does not include urgently needed lifts to allow disabled access at Beecroft Station.
- Beecroft Station Gardens have a heritage listing with Hornsby Council but the impact on them has not been adequately addressed. No arborist's report is given for the trees which will be removed.
- The proposed redevelopment of Cheltenham Station shows no regard for the HCA. The visual impact of the proposed 13m high glass and steel concourse is totally unacceptable in this HCA.
- There has been little or inadequate consideration of Aboriginal archaeology in the area.
- No evaluation has been made of the type of engineering structures and aesthetic finishes which are suitable and compatible for a HCA. This includes retaining walls, embankments, revetments and culverts. Shotcrete is not an acceptable finish in a HCA. This matter should be addressed now in the EIS.

Vegetation

- The EIS is relying on vegetation to lessen the impact of the project on heritage houses and the fabric of the HCA whilst depleting and failing to restore and replenish the vegetation in the rail corridor.
- Depletion of the vegetation has an impact on the amenity of residents immediately adjacent to the corridor.
- Existing vegetation will not reduce the noise impact. A thicket 30m deep is needed to reduce noise by 1dB.

Reduction in Road Traffic

- Claims that the project will reduce road freight are not substantiated. As total freight increases, road freight will also increase. A study published to support another piece of public infrastructure states that 'rail is unlikely to meet the future inter-regional transport task even if major rail infrastructure upgrades occur'. (SKM report F3 to Sydney Orbital Link Study, April (2004).
- Rail freight is for long distance transport of goods. Road freight is for local transport and perishable goods.

Do not approve this project. Protect the Community from these impacts. Impose restrictions on private rail operators.

Signature(s) gcobos

Department of Planning
Received

25 OCT 2012

Send to: The Director - Infrastructure Projects, Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Project - SSI 5132, NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure, GPO Box 39, Sydney 2001 or plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au or fax 9228 6455 before Monday 5 November 2012.

Scanning Room

Vegetation Will Not Screen the Impact

The EIS is relying on vegetation to lessen the impact of the project on heritage houses and the fabric of the HCA whilst at the same time depleting and failing to restore and replenish the vegetation in the rail corridor. Depletion of the vegetation will have an impact on the amenity of residents immediately adjacent to the corridor. Existing vegetation will not reduce the noise impact. A thicket 30m deep is needed to reduce noise by 1dB.

Ignoring our Health - No Government Control on Noise and Pollution

There is no Government agency responsible for noise and pollution in NSW. BCCT commissioned an independent acoustic report which found that 'noise impacts from existing rail movements have a significant adverse impact on the acoustic amenity of residences near the railway. The main impact is at night. Existing railway movements would typically cause around 2 to 3 awakenings per night whereas the typical number of awakenings at night for the general population for reasons other than noise is around 1 awakening'. It concluded 'the adverse effect on sleep is significant'. Sleep disturbance is a recognised stress and is known to impair health. Increased numbers of freight trains will increase the frequency of noise disturbances on top of 'an already unacceptable level'.

The EIS has not adequately considered any future potential increases in rail freight traffic above the current estimate of 41 movements a day. This is likely to occur with the ETTT and any further increase would require a total reassessment of the project.

The EIS **lacks equity** in not considering the high social costs of this project **and integrity** arising from inadequate assessment of noise impacts. Approval should be rejected on these two grounds alone.

Given the delays now associated with the Newcastle coal loader, there is also likely to be an increase in the number of coal trains through our suburbs taking coal to Port Kembla. The EIS does not address the known health issues in the community resulting from increased rail freight namely coal dust from uncovered wagons and diesel particulate matter, a known carcinogen.

These private freight operators should be subjected to legislative controls which protect the community. They should be forced to upgrade to modern high powered locomotives which would avoid the need for this third track.

It Will Not Reduce Road Freight on Pennant Hills Road

Claims that the project will reduce road freight are not substantiated. Rail freight is used for long distance freight of a non-perishable nature between ports and distribution centres - in our case, mostly between Melbourne or Sydney and Brisbane. Road freight is mainly for perishable goods and for shorter, more direct journeys between the distributors and end users. These cannot be made by rail. As total rail freight increases, road freight will also increase. A study published to support another piece of public infrastructure states that 'rail is unlikely to meet the future inter-regional transport task even if major rail infrastructure upgrades occur'. (SKM report *F3 to Sydney Orbital Link Study*, April (2004). **The ETTT is not intended to arrest the growth in road freight and it cannot.**

What You Can Do

If you missed the Information Sessions held on Weds 10 Oct at Cheltenham Recreation Club, 5 – 8pm and Sat 20 Oct at Beecroft Community Centre, 10am – 1pm, you can look at the EIS. It is available at Hornsby Council, Hornsby Library, Pennant Hills Library and Epping Library or on line at www.transport.nsw.gov.au (go to Development Assessment at bottom of page, click 'on exhibition', then on Main North Rail Line, Epping to Thornleigh Third Track).

Most importantly, make a submission before 5 November.

Write your own submission or copy and sign the submission on the last page of this Bulletin and mail it to the address below. You may also drop it in to Ray White Beecroft by Thursday 1 November.

Submissions close on **Monday 5 November**. They must include:

1. Your name and address
2. The proposal name – Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Proposal
3. Application number SSI 5132
4. A statement whether you support or reject the proposals
5. Reasons why you support or reject the proposal.

Submissions are to be sent to: Director – Infrastructure Projects, Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Project – SSI 5132
NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure, GPO Box 39, Sydney 2001 or by email to plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au or fax to 9228 6455

Copy your submission to the Minister for Planning and our local MPs Philip Ruddock and Greg Smith :
office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au; philip.ruddock@aph.gov.au; office@smith.minister.nsw.gov.au