

Due 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018, mail to:

Attn: Director, Infrastructure Projects  
Major Projects Assessment  
Dept Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 SYDNEY, NSW 2001

**Personal submission to the Sydenham to Bankstown Submissions and Preferred Infrastructure  
Report (Application No SSI 17\_8256)**

**July 2018**

Name: Kathryn Burton

Address: 97 Crinan St, Hurlstone Park 2193

☐ I do not consent to my name being published

☐ I have no reportable donations to disclose

Signature:



In addition to a form submission, I have included my specific concerns so this should be treated as a unique submission.

The main concerns I have about the metro, the report on submissions and the preferred project are:

**I am opposed to the conversion of the Sydenham-Bankstown heavy rail line to metro.**

The project, as described so far, has only addressed the widespread concerns about congestion and construction impacts, the planned destruction of railway heritage items and removal of vegetation, **by taking all concerns voiced and written before and formulating responses to make the community go away.**

Unfortunately the response to submissions, and preferred project, falls short of community expectations. My submission follows:

The entire Sydenham to Bankstown urban renewal corridor has been an ill-conceived, rushed and entirely unplanned exercise in the destruction of the fabric and amenity of all the communities along the existing rail corridor at the behest of developers entirely in secret and without any initial community consultation.

Studies here and where implemented overseas have shown and proved that controlled development, continuous consultation provides the best outcomes for all communities.

**What is required is not the destruction of our existing heavy rail line to the city, but an additional line to encompass the Metro.**

Government is not listening to the residents as to where they travel to on the existing rail line. Changing lines where previously we did not to get to the city is a travesty. Presenting us with "artists impressions" is such a nonsense as reality is so far removed from these pipe dreams.

**The funds for the Metro should be diverted to the northern beaches where transport infrastructure is greatly lacking.**

Planned under the Baird Government with Gladys Berejiklian as Treasurer and in conjunction with many property developers through mostly Labor areas this "vision" had absolutely no consultation initially with the general public nor those living in the affected areas. Scoping studies commissioned were, and still are confidential and recently documents acquired by journalists show that lower cost alternatives were strictly forbidden to be acknowledged.

**Good planning is all about creating certainty and community**

It is about creating certainty, amenity, organic growth, atmosphere for the most desirable communities to grow and be profitable. Redeveloping great areas all at once and this monstrous idea of "value add" is an unconscionable idea to perpetrate on any town centre here or anywhere.

Growth in communities must be organic. Medium density low rise housing would be welcomed with the best planning. Councils MUST be allowed to guide the developments to be in keeping with the surrounds of the suburb.

Rampant building development as has happened in Canterbury and parts of Hurlstone Park MUST NOT HAPPEN elsewhere as they will become just like the housing commission slums we are removing here and have been removed from other countries as THEY DO NOT WORK.

**We MUST NOT become like Burwood or Strathfield.**

**The Metro funds MUST be directed to the Northern Beaches.**

**If the Metro is to go to Bankstown IT MUST be a separate line.**

In addition, I endorse the following list of objections and concerns that has been developed by my local community group, the Hurlstone Park Association:

1. The justifications for the project remain unconvincing and have been contradicted by independent rail experts. Alternatives must be addressed such as tunnelling options. A metro for the long distances is not supported.
2. The response to submissions fails to acknowledge that benefits have been over-stated and are over-shadowed by the negative consequences. The trains will have less seating, and commuters will lose many direct connections - those beyond Bankstown will be particularly disadvantaged.
3. Construction and temporary transport issues have not been adequately detailed. The gas leak in the city on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2018 due to metro construction work with rock breakers is a concern; issues with cost blow-outs and legal proceedings for the light rail project do not instill public confidence.

4. The response has ignored community concerns that project will promote growth in a climate of lack of community trust in the planning process and poor quality development without benefits such as affordability, green space and amenity.

5. The franchising to a private operator is not supported. This has not been for the public benefit in Melbourne or Newcastle, and we doubt that privatization in Sydney will pass the public interest test. In particular, the Hong-Kong model of development, utilised by MTR Corporation, is totally inappropriate for many of the heritage -rich and garden suburbs in this corridor

6. The loss of the active green strip takes away one of the few benefits of the project. Further the removal of mature trees and replacing them with small flora is an extremely poor climate change mitigation measure.

7. The response to concerns about community consultation is inadequate and inappropriate. Justifying the many techniques used does not address the lack of engagement with, and failure to prioritise the input of, the communities along the line and beyond Bankstown, who are opposed to the project. In addition, the continued use of biased glossy brochures, which have replaced transparency and meaning, reveals little hope for meaningful consultation in the future.

**This project should not be approved** because it lacks bipartisan and community support, and is the product of process that has lacked democracy and good governance.

**The preferred project, to best benefit communities, and Sydney, should be:**

- retaining the heavy rail, without a private operator
- investing now in time-tables and signalling, and connections for commuters beyond Bankstown
- upgrading all stations for accessibility, safety, landscaping and active transport connections
- retaining and restoring railway heritage to enable railway-related use including rest-rooms and toilets
- prioritising investment in new rail and rapid bus systems across Sydney instead of converting existing lines/ building more toll-ways
- ☐- I have no reportable donations to disclose

Signature:

