

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Russell Hand](#); [Dominic Perrottet](#)
Subject: Re: 242-244 Beecroft Road, Epping (SSD-8784) – Submissions Report
Date: Sunday, 12 January 2020 1:04:34 PM

Russell,

I note from the SEARS for SSD-8784 that *"The Department also wishes to emphasise the importance of effective and genuine community consultation where a comprehensive, detailed and genuine community engagement process must be undertaken during the preparation of the EIS. This process must ensure that the community is provided with a good understanding of what is proposed, description of potential impacts and they are actively engaged in issues of concern to them."* As a side issue, is this aim assisted by the EIS pdf not being searchable?

At page 11, it is claimed: "Landcom has undertaken detailed investigations into the highest and best use of the site consistent with...the delivery of Sydney North West." There are other statements in a similar vein. But there are two requirements to be considered: "highest **and** best". Does "best" not mean "best for the wider community"? Does "delivery" include "patronage"? "Use" suggests patronage is important, especially when the land is already publicly owned.

The Parramatta Light Rail (PLR) website FAQ, clearly a publicly available document, says: "Investigations to date have identified Carlingford to Epping as a future dedicated public transport corridor." A rail connection between Parramatta and Chatswood via Epping (Junction) is also shown in Future Transport 2056.

There is no mention of this corridor in the EIS, so the following question was never canvassed: Which use of the site will deliver the greatest patronage to Metro North-West and the Sydney Trains network in both directions when the choices are—

(a) the Epping terminus for PLR on the site with a building above it and, for example, a pedestrian tunnel under Beecroft Road connecting Epping station; or

(b) the development described in the EIS?

Given historical Census figures show approximately 75% of Epping residents have **not** used public transport for their daily commute despite the existence of Epping station for decades, the number of extra passengers for alternative (b) is likely to be finite and small. With **existing** daytime activities at Macquarie University/Park and beyond and at Westmead, Parramatta and the coming university campus at Rydalmere, extending PRL as suggested has a strong likelihood of serving significantly more passenger traffic through Epping Junction station than Metro North-West itself which has few such attractions west of Macquarie University.

Despite this, the EIS claims at page 3 that, in summary, "the project will support the NSW Government's investment in transport infrastructure..." In the Statement of Validity, the author of the statement declares the contents to the best of his knowledge and belief contains "**all available** information that is relevant to the environmental assessment of the development." This is despite the documents mentioned in the third paragraph of this email.

How can the learned author of the EIS conclude the proponent's proposal is not only the highest, but also the best of anything if there has been no comparison with anything else?

At page 22, consultation is required with the Sydney Coordination Office within TfNSW. This office lists Project delivery offices including PLR. If the Coordination Office was consulted, the only reference is to Sydney Metro, the SSD-8784 applicant. There is *no* reference in the Stakeholder Engagement Outcomes Summary Report 2.4.1 to PLR, which is also an occupant of the Coordination office!

At page 41, The SEARs required consultation with Sydney Trains. But the consultation was *only* with Sydney Metro which is the proponent! *PLR was ignored*. Why did TfNSW delegate its rail authority functions in relation to the Sydney Metro Northwest rail corridor to Sydney Metro rather than to PLR which has identified a public transport corridor and which has an equal, if not greater, interest given its potential to serve more public transport users and will certainly do so if PLR is extended to Epping Junction?

At least the Proponent's Response to Submissions Report pdf is searchable but "Corridor" is only to be found in relation to the metro or the Global Economic Corridor, in which Epping should

always have been considered anyway being one stop from the Corridor's heart at Macquarie Centre. But I digress.

Why have all the issues concerning the other (PLR) transport corridor been ignored or avoided considering the land in question is—

- (a) owned by the public;
- (b) very close to Epping Junction station; and
- (c) vacant?

If the 30-minute city means anything, it has been a failure of planning that a rail junction has not be seen as an opportunity for the creation of an employment or education hub, and not as just another place about which to cluster more apartments.

A rail junction should be seen as an opportunity for the creation of an employment hub, not as just another place about which to cluster more apartments.

On Fri, 3 Jan 2020 at 12:40, [REDACTED] wrote:

In my submission, I made the point that this land is on the planned route of the Parramatta to Chatswood heavy rail line that was meant to have been opened last year. Based on population growth estimates that have since been exceeded, this line was intended to relieve pressure on the existing corridor between Parramatta and the CBD. This land should be retained in public ownership as a public transport corridor against the day when Parramatta Light Rail Stage 1 is extended from Carlingford to Epping to complete the circle of the heavy and light rail network in north-west Sydney. Transport for NSW's Future Transport Strategy 2056 sees Epping being connected to Parramatta by the same network as serves the connection between Epping and Chatswood. This submitted issue was ignored in the response from Landcom to your department, dated "November 2019". Was this an over-sight or could it have been deliberate?

Since then, letters, both dated 16th December, have been received by your department from—

(a) Sydney Metro saying: "Transport for NSW (TfNSW) has delegated its rail authority functions in relation to the Sydney Metro Northwest rail corridor to Sydney Metro" <https://tinyurl.com/vate5ot> and Sydney Metro's interest can be protected by DA conditions; and

(b) Transport for NSW explaining that since 1st December, Roads and Maritime Services has become Transport for NSW (TfNSW) and TfNSW's interest is confined to the deceleration lane and double marked lanes <https://tinyurl.com/rq9x5rg>.

Apparently "rail authority functions" do not extend to **light** rail authority functions. According to <http://www.parramattalightrail.nsw.gov.au>, Parramattalight Rail is a project of TfNSW and "By 2026, around 28,000 people will use Parramatta Light Rail every day and an estimated 130,000 people will be living within walking distance of light rail stops." How many more people will use the service if it is linked to the rest of the rail network at both ends of its length and is thereby attractive to passengers

moving in both directions in journeys to their daytime activities?

Despite the hope that traffic studies would find solutions or improvement to traffic congestion in Carlingford Road/Beecroft Road, the congestion continues unabated and without any sign of relief, thanks to—

- (a) the lack of distance tolling on the M2;
- (b) expansion of residential development beyond that foreshadowed in the planning for the Epping Urban Activation Precinct;
- (c) copious private car parking in Macquarie Park; and
- (d) the proposed additional lane on Epping Bridge only being for the benefit of westbound traffic,

The only possible alleviation to the problem involves increased public transport use.

Parramatta Light Rail stage 1 will only realise its potential when the services in both directions are continued beyond Carlingford station to connect to Metro northwest and the T9 and Central Coast lines at Epping. Until then, those attending Macquarie University or working in Macquarie Park and living in the new residences to be built along the existing T6 line will commute by catching a tram to Carlingford, a bus to Epping and a metro to Macquarie Park. Or they will use their own car.

With the merger of Roads and Maritime and Transport for NSW as recently as 1st December 2019, it may not be surprising that TfNSW does not realise light rail should be considered as part of its responsibilities when it comes to keeping public transport corridors open. Having acquired this property for a (metro) rail corridor, until the public transport use has been completely exploited, the Government should not be considering the surrender of the land to yet more residential development.

