



SUBMISSION FROM BIKES BOTANY BAY SSI-9714: BOTANY RAIL DUPLICATION

bikesbotanybay@hotmail.com

www.bikesbotanybay.wordpress.com

13th November 2019.

Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission. Bikes Botany Bay is a coalition of volunteer advocates for safe, connected and accessible cycling/ pedestrian routes around North Botany Bay - connecting workplaces and recreation areas for workers, local residents and visitors.

The Botany Goods Line Duplication is a major infrastructure project for North Botany Bay which presents opportunities to progress State Government objectives to improve access, connectivity and safety for pedestrian and cyclists (active transport).

Those State Government objectives are expressed in the Greater Sydney Commission District Plan, the Transport for NSW Freight and Ports Plan, The Green Grid, and in the Sydney Cycling Futures Plan. Each of these contains specific references to the Port and surrounding area.

A safe and connected network of bicycle paths is an important part of Sydney's integrated transport system.

We want to make bike riding a convenient and enjoyable option that benefits everyone - by improving access to towns and centres, reducing congestion and increasing capacity on the public transport system.

We are investing \$33 million into cycling in 2013-14 across NSW. This will build new routes, fix missing links in the network and better integrate bike riding with other modes of transport.



Sydney's Cycling Future outlines how we will improve the bicycle network and make sure that the needs of bike riders are built into the planning of new transport and infrastructure projects. It is the first time in our state's history there have been comprehensive plans for active transport.

The NSW Government is working with the Australian Government, councils and the community to plan, prioritise and deliver better connected cycling infrastructure.

Bicycle riding is already a popular form of transport: it costs nothing, improves health, generates zero carbon emissions and, for shorter journeys, can often be quicker than a car or public transport.

The ARTC has not demonstrated in this EIS that it understands the State Government's objectives and should be requested to develop a plan in consultation with Bayside Council, key Active Transport volunteer and peak groups, and the Greater Sydney Commission's Environment Commissioner. It is understood that opportunities within the corridor will be limited, however, these need to properly assessed in a spirit of cooperation with an understanding that it is critical to progress active transport to address current and future demand by residents, workers and visitors.

To illustrate the low level of understanding of the needs of the area I direct NSW Planning to the following figure contained in the proponent's Hazard and Risk Analysis:



Figure 1.1 Botany Rail Duplication location

The third port terminal is not shown. This project included the reclamation of 63 ha of Botany Bay, took out Botany's only beach and Penrhyn Spit and canoeing and windsurfing and other small craft recreation. Readers of the EIS would mistakenly think that residents around this area still had access to the beach and waters when this is not the case. Only fishers who can afford boats have access. What remains of the beach is a highly eroded gross pollutant trap.

The same appears in the Transport study

<https://majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=SSI-9714%2120191001T062254.194%20GMT>



Figure 1.1 Botany Rail Duplication location

Along with this:



Figure 4.1 Sydney rail freight corridor (Sydney Metropolitan Freight Strategy 2015–2024, ARTC, 2015)

Greater Sydney's intermodal terminals play a critical role in increasing the utilisation of the rail freight network by facilitating the transfer of containers and other goods from road to rail. Existing intermodal terminals in Sydney include:

The third terminal was finished long before 2015.

Proponent in this Transport Report states:

“Provision of cycling facilities is also not the role of ARTC and is considered to be outside the scope of the objectives of the project. However, it is worth noting that in the vicinity of the Botany Rail Duplication, other projects such as Gateway and Airport North have active transport corridors in their designs.”

I contend that this is not satisfactory. The Gateway and Airport North cannot stand alone they need to be part of a greater plan. Shared cycling-pedestrian pathways provide very limited benefits when they fail to connect, note the limited use of the path constructed with the Port Expansion.

This is about liveability in Australia's biggest city, Australia's premier economic driver. We don't get the outcomes we need because organisations like the ARTC plead 'this is not my responsibility'. They operate with a social licence and need to recognise their social responsibilities under this licence. In my experience they have exhibited a dismissive, verging on hostile, response to requests to take active transport seriously. Other jurisdictions around the world manage to integrate active transport into industrial and transport hubs for the benefit of workers, residents and visitors. There is no good reason why the ARTC can't make a contribution in TRYING to address the problems faced on North Botany Bay. Their recalcitrance makes a mockery of statements made on State/Commonwealth cooperation and in particular with regard to the planning objectives of the NSW Government for this area.

Should you require further information, please contact me on 0409698321.

Regards,
Lynda Newnam
Coordinator