

Response to EIS Parramatta light Rail Stage 2

<https://majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=SSI-10035%2120221104T043354.925%20GMT>

<https://pp.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/projects/parramatta-light-rail-stage-2>

<https://plr2.ghdengage.com/virtual-room/more-information/>

From Reading through the Documentation on the DPIE portal and those in the virtual room, documentation is not consistent.

The Public is not informed of what is to be Approved.

Reports don't match with Summaries and so there are many Disparities throughout the documentation on exhibition

EIS process is seemingly rushed and ad hoc by carelessness in its execution

so, it's flawed. **Leading to Question: What Is the Proposal of the EIS, that is to be approved.**

So that Public comment can be made on that.

The rest of this response is to the numerous and Significant Issues.....

1. ACTIVE Transport

From the Chapter 9 9.3 Assessment of construction impacts

9.3.4 Active transport

The section of the Parramatta Valley Cycleway through the project site at Eric Primrose Reserve would be

closed during construction of the north abutment of the bridge between Camellia and Rydalmere.

A temporary detour of the cycleway would be provided along John Street, Antoine Street and Jean Street

to maintain connectivity around the work area.

[Does not relate to the Option The preferred Option being Appendix D Camellia foreshore to Rydalmere

is The Better of the two options. But Figure ES4 shows the original crossing only]

The detour would add about 150 metres of additional travel

distance for path users. Access to the site compound over the shared use path may require temporary

traffic control to stop path users while a vehicle enters or exits the site.

[the following section doesn't relate to Section 5.6.1 option Figure 5.25 This is Most desirable alternative alignment],

The section of the Parramatta Valley Cycleway using Wharf Road at Melrose Park would be disrupted by

road closures and the construction compound at Wharf Road car park associated with the proposed bridge

between Melrose Park and Wentworth Point.

The shared use path through Koonadan Reserve connecting

to Wharf Road would also be closed. A temporary detour of the cycleway would be provided connecting the

existing path along Waratah Street to Wharf Road, Andrew Street and Lancaster Avenue. This detour would add about 70 metres of additional travel distance for path users.

Access to and from the west for bicycles and pedestrians would be maintained through the work areas

using traffic control.

Access to the River Walk and Louise Sauvage Pathway on the southern side of Parramatta River would be

maintained during construction as far as practicable. **The virtual documentation says that this will be closed**

Impacts on other on-road cycling facilities and pedestrian facilities would be managed in a similar manner

as road closures, with detours provided in advance of closures. All temporary detours or alternate routes

would provide safe and efficient routes and, wherever possible, meet relevant accessibility requirements.

The proposed replacement active transport routes would be defined in the traffic and access management plan.

Assessment of operational impacts. 9.4.3 Active transport

The proposed active transport links would connect to the existing and proposed active transport network in

the City of Parramatta and City of Ryde local government areas, filling gaps in the existing networks and

providing enhanced opportunities for increased movement and activity, particularly across the Parramatta

River. The proposed facilities would encourage higher use of active transport overall and provide a viable

alternative to existing active transport routes that may experience congestion.

The project (including the two bridges over the Parramatta River) would create three walking and cycling

'loops' centred around the river in Camellia, Ermington and Wentworth Point, which would encourage

movement and active lifestyles, and potentially draw in visitors from outside these areas.

FAIL: The problem is these active transport links will not be materialised for at least 3 +years of Construction is over.

In the light of PLR stage 1 has significantly delayed it's opening by 1 year is an example, of what could reasonably be expected from PLR /TforNSW Project Management team.

Given the completed Active transport link for Stage 1, that should have been progressively opened as sections were completed. Is NOT available, despite being competed many months ago

- Will be waiting for opened till LR / trams are running. The EIS doesn't expressly say that the corridor will be progressively opened either.

2. The turn Back at Macquarie St – Stage 2 ends in Macquarie St. Disaster for Eat Street and North Parramatta.

This is Totally undesirable feature.

The EIS documentation and the exhibition online suite of documents Don't reveal the impacts. And they give a confusing account of what is proposed, only Highlighted in the Summary document Other Works and Figure ES.4 clearly shows the Turnback occupying all of Macquarie St in between Church and Marsden Streets. Chapter 9 Transport & Traffic table 9.1

But this is Effectively hidden in the exhibition virtual portal documentation. Any turnback in this area will be a major setback for Church St shopping. Given the siting of the curve at this point Getting the correct track geometry is a major dislocation. And, not good for operational safety reasons being on such a tight curve, within a major active pedestrian Zone

Thus, access to anywhere along Macquarie St and Church St is a major Blocker It's an active construction zone Given the major redevelopment for Metro West. And other building that are accessed - **FAIL** - NOT SUPORTED

3. Camellia – Rydalmere Precinct

The connection using the existing Sandown Rail Corridor is a Great use of this corridor .

1. The perplexing issue is access from the Proposed Sandown Boulevard LR station to Racecourse and the active link South.

When the existing Granville to Camellia Rail link was the removal, The active link was proposed. The was no reference to the removal of the Grand Ave Road over Rail corridor Bridge. PLR EIS was vague on what the actual plan was.

The key activation Idea was to use PLR to provide a transport solution to the Rose hill /Camellia Town centre.

The Grand Avenue bridge is a known bottleneck, it's not needed in its existing form to provide access over the non-existent rail corridor. The PLR rendered it redundant. But PLR project EIS that focus on providing Transport solutions just Failed to accomplish this effectively. Its treatment was not shown as part active transport link of this Stage 2 activity nor Stage 1

So, My Objection is PLR failed to provide an adequate transport link Unless the Grand Ave bridge removal is part of this staged Project.

2. There is mention of an Active transport link but the link along Sandown Boulevard is not indicated. It should have been part of Stage 1 infrastructure. As the corridor would have had adequate separation.

But this been compromised by its not being designed. Now Stage 2 does not indicate the exact location or its availability .

A big flaw in PLR Stage 1 has been the active transport link, which is totally complete, is not available until trams are running.

A contract issue - Not Scheduled into the Works program.

The link is effectively a separate piece of infrastructure within the corridor. In most cases fenced off from the active LR infrastructure.

THE EIS for stage 2 do not guarantee that this will not be the case in Stage 2

EIS needs provide for an Active transport link being progressively available.

So, My Objection is PLR EIS failed to provide an adequate transport link until trams are running for this separate Infrastructure, and this is a flawed approach to fulfilling the Active Transport requirements **FAIL**

3. The Number Two options to cross to Rydalmere from Camellia offered SUPPORTED

The preferred Option being Appendix D Camellia foreshore to Rydalmere is The Better of the two options. But Figure ES4 shows the original crossing only

Both have significant drawbacks connecting into Parramatta Valley Cycleway / active corridor and Eric Primrose reserve will mostly be preserved Post construction . This options use of the existing rail corridor to the river and the minimal disruption to the river environment and the potential to reroute the PRVC while Construction with using Park Road as a cycling and Walking Path makes it a better option.

Both options impact the existing Active corridor Parramatta Valley Cycleway . The active corridor Needs to be maintained throughout construction. There are no details of the proposed Interconnection with the proposed Active Corridor and the existing PVC.

This option moves the Light rail Station closer to the Wharf near 48 & 50 Antoine Street rather than further north in Johns Street This makes it more disability friendly

This is Highly Commendable. So that Mode Transfers are simple. Simple transfers are not something that Transport for NSW projects are known for.

A Box Girder Incrementally launched from the southern Bank would be Preferred this would allow for a curve that would give a more pleasing form of bridge . Given it's a major structure on this narrow section of the river. The design would complement the Journey experience on Sydney's major navigable river.

Why this than further east crossing. The Journey along Grand Ave is a journey a history lesson of heavy & Light Industry and years of neglect. Apart from the Bland scenery and the amount of heavy traffic. Its aroma permeates into the interior of vehicles . Not a good smell or the noise of the area makes this an unattractive journey along this route. Even with this area being cleaned up. The river crossing west is by for the nicer option.

4. Ermington to Melrose Park - A unique feature of PLR Stage 2, the Roller Coaster ride

General Failing of the EIS There is no cut and fill diagrams to indicate the treatment of variations to achieve a reasonable steady grade. One can only expect that the route that is already a series of crossings of ridge Lines, will be unpleasant amusement ride. A few words here and there are the only assurance that some sections might be relatively on a steady grade.

Ken Newman Park section see Chapter 5 Design development, alternatives, and options

Nothing about the final grade of the Light Rail is shared park in this area is defined on Ken Newman Park section . The information in 5.4.4 option preferred is to use the at grade option. Rather than the viaduct option. And the GAF Light rail vehicles are already contracted.

I'm alarmed with the At Grade option selected, given the less than desirable grade solution proposed

This will cause operational issues Perhaps a Hybrid of Option 1 and 2 together with a less severe grade where the section of Boronia Street from Tumble to Spurway Street is lowered entirely. Given even with sanding gear Light rail vehicle could effectively stall over this section in wet weather

There is no information on the method of Traffic control at Spurway St. So that's an issue
UNRESOLVED – overall a FAIL

The proposed route on paper, to Melrose Park South and the new precinct leading to it from Parramatta are reasonable. But with No Grade diagrams that adequately define what it will finally be constructed like is incredibly annoying. EIS that not for public use It seems. **FAIL**

5. Missing element River Crossing

However, we have missed the best part of A building Stage 2 river crossing , the complete removal of the Ausgrid transmission lines across the river by incorporating them into the Bridges River crossing is Most Desired.

This is not in the EIS but would provide one significant structure rather than two as the power lines dominate the river at this point. The river Journey on Sydney's major navigable river would enhance the Significance of the River in Sydney's History. The river Journey is a Tourism Gem. **FAIL - missed opportunity**

Section 5.6.1 option Figure 5.25 This is Most desirable alternative alignment, is SUPORTED.

Figure ES 4 and most of the EIS documentation does not show this option.

SO, what Is Proposed for the EIS to be approved?

6. Impact on the PVC near both river crossings - Archer Park, Waratah St & Wharf Road

The impact on the ACTIVE corridor here right near the Mangroves, where the proposed work connects especially but not limited to, this section of the Parramatta Valley Cycleway . As will be the mangroves and the Major Utilities such as Pipelines and Transmission Lines VHV Power that the PVC traverses following the river. Especially as these will all intersect at this point. Given Wharf Road is access to Ermington Boat ramp. Yes There are plans to relocate this Boat launching facility. The community dislocation is already High. Given the preliminary works have impacted already.

- REMOVAL of the toilet block is Not Appreciated and should be made available or alternative public facilities provided

It is imperative that a suitable off-road route through this area be established for the lengthy Build stage of this Crossing. Parramatta Valley Cycleway is an existing route and needs to remain available and being available to Transport for NSW own requirements for building, as if it's a permanent infrastructure. The EIS talks effectively of temporary in standard and location during construction. This relocation should be to the Higher standard.

And NOT NSWG normal standard of typically sub contacted work, which is No standard, Just marked lines. Or using Temporary barricades that shift from day to day. With spray chalk white lines on the roads no separation from active traffic lanes or worse no wayfinding. These existing Active transport corridors need to be treated as a State Road would.

These are not acceptable given the high volumes of traffic that exist and will exist with the Melrose South Urbanisation are to run at the same time as the PLR Stage 2 will.

7. Wentworth Point, A Point of Failure.

The construction Impacts are BAD as there is effectively no safe access to the waterfront pathway to the Armory or Louise Sauvage Pathway according to the Works Documents

A change of Route!

The new detour that closes the Louise Sauvage Pathway for 3 years .

The initial pathway for this stage had rail on this southern sided of the river, travelling beside the foreshore park on Lapwing St within the new estate.

This would have had minimal impact on the riparian zone next to the Armory wetlands and the lessened the impact on Louise Savage Pathway this is a key Walking and Cycling Corridor. Putting the Wentworth Point LR Stop closer to the Ferry Wharf.

New Route - Some why was this changed? - The interchange to the Ferry service and the Active link Verses land acquisition that was already agreed in a VPA

It would have meant also that the Interchange from Ferry to Light rail would have been easy. but mysteriously the PLR plans are for No interchange and opting to effectively intruding on the parkland space that surrounds Wattlebird Rd to the south. To the benefit of the developer of the estate?

Perhaps intentionally We see in the Executive summary say the PLR Stage 2 interchanges with the Ferry at Wentworth Point I guess the no one considered that the distance to call something a interchange is perhaps 50 metres, but here its hardly an easy interchange.

Transport For NSW, and PLR have together a great history of not providing Mode interchanges, comes into play. So, Bugger the travelling public especially the Less mobile. Any idea of traveling with any disability compliance requirements for mode changes in 2020's is flouted for this project. This EIS reveals the proponents don't want Mode changes. **FAIL.**

8. Hooker Busway Light Rail Stop, really an odd location.

Hooker Busway Light Rail Stop is not to be where the current Bus let downs towards the Ticketing and amenities blocks are. And the existing Active link. Is this just a Stop for Urban surf? . But at the corner of Hill Road. The pathway to the existing estate west of the intersection is not a route to encourage residents to utilise this service.

T For NSW and PLR did a similar crazy thing in making Parramatta Stadium unserved by the Light rail. Stating they were Afraid to site for light rail stops, where the there is an abundance of potential user. But opting for a less active area/ perhaps they don't like Ridership on LR. We still have an inbuilt Car centric mentality within our Government Agencies. **FAIL.**

9. Bridge over Haslem's Creek

Bridge over Haslem's Creek . The EIS Proposed treatment is strengthened it. Not sure if this is more than a hope. The other options are less than desirable. For this highly sensitive area **GREAT if it works!**

Given this piece of the creek is tidal and is a natural corridor for much of the wildlife. The routes for walking and cycling under the southern abutment are part of that corridor and closure is not appreciated by the many users of that human link.

Given. The other crossing on Bennelong Parkway is incredibly inadequate. And The Increase in traffic from the PLR roadworks will make that crossing and the surrounding walk and cycleway become even more dangerous as it currently over- capacity

Especially ,Given This Hooker Busway bridge is an active transport link for Buses, Pedestrians, and cyclists but it an area of concern, as there is no other route to access Olympic Park and parklands beyond, that's easily walkable and rideable.

10. Olympic Park

The initial Olympic Park LR stop, Is at the opposite end of the heavy rail station, Main station Entrance and Amenities. Another Mode change Failure

Thank You for this chance to comment

Kim Riley, Westmead