

## Objections to CBD and South East Light Rail Modifications Report

Naomi Henry  
22 Doncaster Ave,  
Kensington, NSW 2033  
[cyberjoey@bigpond.com](mailto:cyberjoey@bigpond.com)

## Objections to CBD and South East Light Rail Modifications Report

From my reading and understanding of the Modifications Report, a lot of major changes are being made to that already approved, simply to fit in with ATC Race days.

Race days are held on a few days a year. The residents of the Eastern Suburbs deal with moving around the city every day.

I wish to raise an objection to:

- 1) The raising of the ground level in the Randwick Stabling Yard
- 2) The re-alignment of the Light Rail track to the north side of Alison Rd rather than the original approved site on the south side of Alison Rd.
- 3) The loss of even more of the beautiful old trees in this green space.

1) On Page 59 of the report, under Operational Assessment, the report states:

### Operational assessment

With respect to operational flooding and drainage impacts resulting from the proposal,

section 10.2.2 of the CSELR Project EIS (Volume 1A) (Transport for NSW, 2013) noted the results of the Centennial Park Flood Study (WMA Water, 2013). The results showed that the location of the Randwick stabling facility is inundated in the one in five year average recurrence interval (ARI) flood event and all events beyond this. The depth of flooding across the site was identified as up to 200 millimetres in the one in five ARI flood event (based on existing ground levels).

The proposed increase in the existing levee bank would increase the flood water detention within the Centennial Parklands (in particular the Centennial Park ponds area) during operation of the light rail. As discussed in section 3.7.2, the proposed raising of the existing levee bank adjacent to the southern end of Centennial Park would provide increased flood protection for up to the 1 in 100 year flood event. This would provide an improved operational reliability for the light rail (in particular the operation of the Randwick stabling facility) in addition to wider benefits to the local road network and residential properties within the vicinity of the stabling facility.

On Page 80 of the report, under Height increase to the Randwick Stabling Yard, the report states:

### 3.12 Height increase to the Randwick stabling facility

#### 1. 3.12.1 Description of the approved project

Section 5.2.10 of the CSELR Project EIS (Volume 1A) (Transport for NSW 2013), provided a description of the proposed Randwick stabling

facility. As described in the CSELR Project EIS, the Randwick stabling facility is to be used for the following activities:

- ● to temporarily store or retain LRVs overnight
- ● for LRV inspection and cleaning (including wash plant)
- ● for light maintenance or repair work, including vehicle sanding (topping up the sand boxes within the LRVs for use on wet/slippery tracks).

Subsequent to the CSELR Project EIS, the Minister for Planning's approval included a condition (B36(e)), which required the following with respect to the proposed Randwick stabling facility:

(e) The maximum height of any buildings or structures required as part of the stabling facility is 10.5 metres above ground level (existing).

In addition, in order to mitigate potential flooding impacts, the approved project proposed to raise the existing ground level of the Randwick stabling facility by approximately two metres above existing ground level.

If you raise the levee bank 300mm, ipso facto, the level of the Stabling Facility does not need to be raised two metres.

Raising the level of the Stabling Yard will in itself raise flooding concerns for neighbours from water run-off from the site.

Raising the level of the Stabling Yard will dwarf the residences beside it, taking away even further light and increasing the intrusiveness of the massive structure we are now going to have instead of the heritage listed fig trees that are currently there.

## 2) Alison Road Rail Stop

Alison Rd is one of the main feeder roads into Randwick and via its off-shoot Darley Rd, into Bondi Junction, Coogee, Bronte and Clovelly.

Coming up Anzac Parade from the South, there is no right turn from Anzac Parade into Alison Rd. Therefore, all traffic wishing to utilise Alison Rd from the South have to turn into Doncaster Ave, and travel up Doncaster Ave to turn right on Alison Rd. This massive traffic input to Alison Rd seems to be totally ignored in any of the documents I have read. Traffic is often banked up around this intersection, and back down Doncaster Ave. In the Modifications Report we now have the preposterous proposition that between Doncaster Ave and Darley Rd, (1 block in length), we are going to have: three pedestrian crossings (stopped traffic); two light rail crossings (stopped traffic); one tram station where presumably whenever a 67 metre tram is stopped, as in Melbourne, all the traffic behind it will have to stop as well to prevent road deaths. Stopping the traffic for the trams will in itself lead to massive traffic compression waves. Plus we are to lose the free left turn lane into Darley Rd. It is this left turn into Darley Road that the bulk of the traffic turning from Doncaster Ave into Alison Rd utilises. I cannot believe that this proposal has been passed by a traffic engineer.

Changing the position of the rail stop, may make things a little less congested on the race course on race day, but that is not much consolation for the chaos it is going to cause on local roads for local residents, every day.

3) The Centennial Parklands/Randwick Race Course Precinct is meant to be a green space. The Proposed modification to relocate the rail line and station to the north side of Alison Rd would change the continuity of the green space by positioning a three metre wall on the north side of Alison Rd, and then another fence down the middle of Alison Rd to make pedestrians use one of the three pedestrian crossings. All the trees down Alison Rd between Doncaster Ave and Darley Rd would go. I'm not sure from where the idea has risen, but planners seem to think that replacing 400 year old trees with new ones is OK. As a resident, I don't think it's OK, and neither I'm sure would the animals that inhabit them and use them as a food source.