



## Appendix **C**

### Stakeholder issues raised during consultation

## Issued Raised by Government Agencies

Stakeholder	Issues raised
Blacktown Council	<p data-bbox="633 389 913 416"><b>Planning Focus Meeting</b></p> <ul data-bbox="633 432 1279 619" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="633 432 1167 459">▪ Commuter car parking at Quakers Hill Station</li><li data-bbox="633 472 1155 499">▪ Operation of new Westminster Street Bridge</li><li data-bbox="633 512 1216 539">▪ Consultation during design of station interchanges</li><li data-bbox="633 552 1279 579">▪ Access across rail corridor at existing Schofields Station</li><li data-bbox="633 592 947 619">▪ Impact of moving station</li></ul> <p data-bbox="633 632 1077 659"><b>Submission to Department of Planning</b></p> <ul data-bbox="633 671 1339 699" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="633 671 1339 699">▪ Further consultation, particularly regarding final station design</li></ul>
Ministry of Transport	<p data-bbox="633 716 913 743"><b>Planning Focus Meeting</b></p> <ul data-bbox="633 759 1155 903" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="633 759 1133 786">▪ Integrated transport within the project area</li><li data-bbox="633 799 1155 826">▪ Joint work between agencies (Mot and RTA)</li><li data-bbox="633 839 987 866">▪ Adequate parking provisions</li><li data-bbox="633 879 1077 906">▪ Assessment of road network impacts</li></ul> <p data-bbox="633 919 1077 946"><b>Submission to Department of Planning</b></p> <ul data-bbox="633 959 1697 1182" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="633 959 1697 986">▪ Existing pedestrian/cycle movements, determine whether proposal can meet increased demand</li><li data-bbox="633 999 1301 1026">▪ All car parking proposals to be submitted for consideration</li><li data-bbox="633 1038 1205 1066">▪ Safety issues (pedestrian level crossing removal)</li><li data-bbox="633 1078 1021 1106">▪ Accommodate all traffic models</li><li data-bbox="633 1118 1182 1145">▪ Preserve existing corridor for North West Metro</li><li data-bbox="633 1158 1384 1185">▪ Include Ministry of Transport as an agency for further consultation</li></ul>
Department of Environment and Climate Change	<p data-bbox="633 1203 913 1230"><b>Planning Focus Meeting</b></p> <ul data-bbox="633 1246 1249 1350" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="633 1246 1211 1273">▪ Alternative locations for Vineyard Station car park</li><li data-bbox="633 1286 1066 1313">▪ Planning and assessment of offsets</li><li data-bbox="633 1326 1249 1353">▪ Consideration of at-source noise mitigation measures</li></ul>

Stakeholder	Issues raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sustainability measures at new stations</li> <li>▪ Details of water quality in water bodies crossed by the rail corridor</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission to Department of Planning</b></p> <p><b><i>Noise and Vibration</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction (project timeframe, location, mitigation measures)</li> <li>▪ Operational (noise predictions, mitigation measures)</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Flora and fauna</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minimise and mitigate biodiversity impacts (both in and outside NWGC)</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Aboriginal cultural heritage</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identify, describe actions and consult with aboriginal community groups</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Water quality and fluvial processes</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Impacts of project, mitigation and management.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Traffic and transport</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Impacts, requirements</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Contaminated land</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assess site contamination and remediate</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Resource conservation and waste management</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minimise water and energy consumption (predicted GHGs saved)</li> <li>▪ Waste and resource management options</li> </ul>
Roads and Traffic Authority	<p><b>Planning Focus Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integrated transport within the project area</li> <li>▪ Joint work between agencies</li> <li>▪ Adequate parking provisions</li> <li>▪ Assessment of road network impacts</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission to Department of Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Traffic movements, impacts on intersections, parking provisions as result of development</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Issues raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction management Plan, public transport details (including pedestrians and cyclists)</li> </ul> <p><b>Riverstone Station</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pedestrian bridge, impacts on railway level crossing</li> </ul> <p><b>Schofields Station</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Vehicular and pedestrian connections</li> <li>▪ Consult RTA, GCC and Blacktown City Council (re: railway level design)</li> </ul> <p><b>Vineyard Station</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consider future grade separation</li> </ul> <p><b>Bus integration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consider how the railway will integrate with future community (take into account the level of train line construction, which will directly affect the quality of access by buses)</li> </ul>
Growth Centres Commission	<p><b>Planning Focus Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Exhibition of Environmental Assessment coinciding with exhibition of precinct plans for the North West Growth Centre</li> <li>▪ Broad transport focus including consideration of pedestrians and cyclists</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission to Department of Planning</b></p> <p><b>Traffic and transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Further opportunities for pedestrians and cyclists (e.g. multi-user access paths)</li> </ul> <p><b>Flora and fauna</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project should comply with the Growth Centres Biodiversity Certification in accordance with the Biodiversity Certification Order</li> </ul>
RailCorp	<p><b>Planning Focus Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Avoidance of conditions that may limit the ability to meet safety requirements</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission to Department of Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Safety and crossings</li> <li>▪ Station operations during construction</li> <li>▪ Disabled access</li> <li>▪ Rail infrastructure requirements</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Issues raised
Heritage office of the Department of Planning	<p><b>Submission to Department of Planning</b></p> <p><b><i>Cultural heritage</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand heritage impact statement to include all items of potential heritage significance</li> <li>▪ Consider heritage significance of site</li> <li>▪ Consideration of other heritage databases (e.g. National Trust)</li> <li>▪ Include non aboriginal heritage items affected</li> <li>▪ Include impact on places, items and relics significant to aboriginal people</li> </ul>
NSW Department of Primary Industries	<p><b>Submission to Department of Planning</b></p> <p>Consideration, where relevant, of the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Dredging and reclaiming activities:</li> <li>▪ Impacts to marine life</li> <li>▪ Activities that block fish passage</li> <li>▪ Impacts to Threatened species</li> </ul>
Department of Water and Energy	<p><b>Submission to Department of Planning</b></p> <p><b><i>Watercourses</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identify all watercourses</li> <li>▪ Identify impacts, safeguard measures and crossings of nearby tributaries or wetlands</li> <li>▪ Assess impacts on the perennial lake (sec.5.3.2 of PAR)</li> <li>▪ Consideration of impacts to groundwater</li> </ul>
Hawkesbury Council	<p><b>Planning Focus Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased patronage on Richmond Line resulting from the development of the North West sector and sub-region</li> <li>▪ Possible links with the North West Rail link</li> </ul>
Department of Planning	<p><b>Planning Focus Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consideration of contingency plan if Garfield Road level crossing and closure of Meatworks crossing does not occur concurrently</li> </ul>

## Issued raised by Community members

Community Submission No.	Issues raised
Community submission # 1	Concerns with Station relocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ parents too old to walk to the new Schofields Station from Kensington Park Road Nirimba Station should be built</li><li>▪ the existing station has low operational cost as there is no station master, counter ticket sales or maintenance of the gardens</li></ul>
Community submission # 2	Objects to Schofields relocation due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ additional commuting time from longer walk to the station</li><li>▪ increase greenhouse gas emissions if more people start driving to the station</li><li>▪ loss of business at Schofields shops (intends to discourage community to use any new shops at the new station)</li><li>▪ need to consider existing residents, not just future population</li></ul>
Community submission # 3	Objects to Schofields relocation due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ removal of easy access to facilities (including shops, which won't be sustainable following relocation of the station)</li><li>▪ new station will be unsafe as it will be located in the middle of empty fields without many houses along the way</li><li>▪ abandoned shops at Schofields will become a welcoming ground for hooligans and vandals</li><li>▪ why are there no plans to provide access from the western side of Schofields</li><li>▪ Nirimba Station should be built and Schofields left</li></ul>
Community submission # 4	Objects to Schofields relocation due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ relocation of Schofields Station will cause inconvenience as walks to Station daily</li><li>▪ wants footpath from Bridge Street to new Schofields Station (western side of Schofields)</li></ul>
Community submission # 5	Objects to Schofields relocation due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Made representations to the Member for Riverstone, John Acquilina</li><li>▪ Mr Acquilina provided a copy of his 6 May 2008 speech to Parliament on the issue.</li><li>▪ Why has the GCC changed its mind about constructing Nirimba Station?</li></ul>
Community submission # 6	Objects to Schofields relocation due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ footpath access to new railway station needed at end of Bridge St (western Schofields)</li><li>▪ why are there no plans to provide access from the western side of Schofields</li></ul>

Community Submission No.	Issues raised
Community submission # 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Nirimba Station should be built and Schofields left</li> <li>▪ lack of communication consultation, residents were not informed at planning stage</li> </ul> <p>Concerns &amp; objections to Schofields relocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ compensation for loss of home value and adjacency to station (inconvenience)</li> <li>▪ bus service is not an adequate replacement offer (time management issues)</li> <li>▪ need to consider existing residents, not just future population</li> <li>▪ station being removed from area of future development</li> <li>▪ Nirimba Station should be built and Schofields left</li> <li>▪ not serving the majority of people</li> </ul>
Community submission # 8	<p>Concerns with Station relocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ current facility is convenient (walking dist)</li> <li>▪ property value related to close proximity of current station</li> <li>▪ elderly reliance on close public transport</li> <li>▪ negative impact on local business</li> </ul> <p>Support for station at Nirimba</p>
Community submission # 9	<p>Concerns with Station relocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ current facility is convenient (walking dist)</li> <li>▪ property value related to close proximity of current station</li> <li>▪ elderly reliance on close public transport</li> <li>▪ negative impact on local business</li> <li>▪ support for station at Nirimba</li> </ul>
Community submission # 10	<p>Strong objection to removal of Schofields Station:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ wont meet requirements of huge development happening in the area</li> <li>▪ support for Nirimba Station; meets needs of future developments/car parking/etc. w/out closing current station</li> <li>▪ build new station near Burdekin Rd (vacant government land - residential future?)</li> <li>▪ petition of 1500 anti-station handed to Blacktown Mayor 4th May</li> </ul>

Community Submission No.	Issues raised
Community submission # 11	<p>Objects to Schofields relocation due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ keep existing station AND create new one</li> <li>▪ disadvantage to established communities</li> <li>▪ elderly users and local commuters at a significant disadvantage</li> <li>▪ others drive to current station, what is the point in making community do that</li> <li>▪ this station doesn't just cater for City commuters, but also stops in between</li> <li>▪ lack of state planning, lack of provision for community facilities</li> </ul>
Community submission # 12	<p>Objects to Schofields relocation due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ distance problem for elderly residents, both transport and shopping-wise</li> <li>▪ negative impact on local business</li> <li>▪ support for Nirimba station addition, serves economic expansion in that area</li> <li>▪ heritage/historic value "John Schofield" gifted the station land</li> <li>▪ current station and line is above flood levels</li> </ul>
Community submission # 13	<p>Concerns with Station relocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ decrease in value of Station St property, request for compensation</li> <li>▪ request for access bridge over proposed extra lanes close to centre of town</li> <li>▪ impact on small business</li> <li>▪ traffic increase</li> <li>▪ objects to complete closure of station</li> </ul>
Community submission # 14	<p>Concerns with Station relocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ parents are local residents and are too old to walk to the new Schofields Station</li> <li>▪ wanted to know if a bus service would be set-up to compensate</li> </ul>
Community submission # 15	<p>Concerns with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ construction of rail line in a 1:100 flood zone</li> <li>▪ future line from Rouse Hill to Vineyard (displayed in 2008 St Directory)</li> <li>▪ land release by Landcome</li> </ul>

Community Submission No.	Issues raised
Community submission # 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ changes on Garfield Rd</li> <li>▪ relocation of Schofields Station</li> </ul>
Community submission # 17	<p>Concerns and objections to Schofields relocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ objects to line duplication</li> <li>▪ community info sessions are not for benefit of community and community feedback doesn't have an affect on "already-made" decisions by govt</li> <li>▪ little or no transport facilities for Rouse Hill residents</li> <li>▪ NSW govt not learn from their mistakes?</li> <li>▪ elderly users at a significant disadvantage regarding access to med treatments, shopping, visiting etc.</li> <li>▪ unsuitability of the relocation for Schofields Public School children, and HS children (Riverstone High) as well as university students who all use Schofields Station</li> <li>▪ homes built/bought with reference to close proximity of station</li> <li>▪ money saved by retaining station could be used to extend line Vineyard-Rouse-Blacktown</li> <li>▪ historical value of Schofields station</li> </ul>
Community submission # 18	<p>Objection to relocation of Schofields Station:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ easy access of current station for children and elderly</li> <li>▪ Schofields station is the heart of the community</li> <li>▪ property bought based on the convenience of local station</li> <li>▪ immigration of ethnic communities to station area</li> <li>▪ farms, homes &amp; businesses built around Schofields Station</li> <li>▪ elderly users at a significant disadvantage regarding access to med treatments, shopping, visiting etc.</li> <li>▪ why not modify/maintain/innovate/add to existing station?</li> <li>▪ why replace the adjacent pedestrian crossing?</li> <li>▪ the future economy of the community</li> <li>▪ funding for loss of services &amp; trade &amp; isolation of businesses</li> </ul>
Community submission # 19	Did not receive notification about the project – poor consultation

Community Submission No.	Issues raised
Community submission # 20	<p>Concerns with Station relocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ very little practical info at the community information session</li> <li>▪ why wasn't a proper investigation conducted in order that all options could be displayed and enable the rigor of the supporting data to be tested?</li> <li>▪ support for inclusion of additional station at Nirimba</li> <li>▪ name of new station is not relative to its location (Narimba is geographically closer to the proposed site)</li> <li>▪ Rouse hill residents complained re limited parking, therefore badly planned considering should be to their advantage (over Schofields itself)</li> </ul>
Community submission # 21	<p>Concerns with Station relocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ clarify proposed relocation of Vineyard station south of its current position</li> <li>▪ he owns property close to new station position</li> <li>▪ requested information on changes in the area, i.e. shopping centres</li> </ul>
Community submission # 22	<p>Concern with Station relocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ past failure to follow thru with line duplication promises/projects/proposals</li> <li>▪ suggests possible relocation of Westminster Bridge to end of Schofields Rd</li> </ul>
Community submission # 23	Additional railway station between Riverstone and Vineyard (in the vicinity of Loftus Street)