

2 December 2012

Major Projects Assessment

Department of Planning and Infrastructure

Sydney, NSW 2001

"Attention: Director, Infrastructure Projects"

Epping NSW 2121

SUBMISSION-Northwestraillink-EIS2-overview –Application number (SSI-5414)

Dear Sir

I am in **Support** of the proposal for the North West Rail Line as depicted in the Overview Assessment Report on EIS 2 and the relevant Technical Papers outlining the approach, **subject** to the following modifications suggested for the reasons adduced:

- 1) The Report proposes the biggest transport infrastructure project in Sydney, to deliver reliable single deck train service to Customers, with a frequency of five minutes during peak times ,travelling from Rouse Hill to Epping on 23km of new track. The new Rail Link project involves the construction of eight new stations, 4000 parking spaces, Australia's longest twin rail tunnel 15 km long 63 m at the deepest point between Epping and Bella Vista followed by 4km of viaduct and a further 4km of bridges, embankments and surface tracks to Rouse Hill terminal. It is envisaged to provide public transport for an extra 200,000 people moving into the North West. Such a great effort is well appreciated as a long overdue development for that Region.

My greatest concern is the Strategy employed in bringing about the proposed benefit. What it purports to endow with one hand it takes away with the other. The downside of it is that it appears to be uncoordinated and deprives the existing users of what they cherish and enjoy in a democratic manner in the public interest as opposed to the future beneficiaries, with a limited vision for the present as well as the future users in North West Sydney. Those specific issues are:

- a) Debilitating cuts by down grading and penalising rail users mainly living in Beecroft, Cheltenham and Epping of the existing facilities (at grade)and the number and frequency of service of the direct rail link to the City. Their Route choice is limited and their property values would plummet due to access limitations. Besides, they need to change at Epping and Chatswood, no sooner the NWRL is operational. The Beecroft ,Cheltenham (Epping) community land is surrendered for the NWRL but they are deprived of direct access to the City by Rail on the same rail project!
- b) Secondly, I am pleased that my request in response to my EIS 1 Submission for a future provision for the Epping Parramatta Rail Link has received consideration ,recognised by the provision of an Epping Services Facility for a future PERL safeguarding.
- c) Thirdly, in my previous Submission and also in relation to ETTT Submission, I requested consideration for Piggy Banking the twin tunnels for NWRL and the ETTT Freight Rail from Epping to Thornleigh, to run along the same alignment starting from Epping to Pennant Hills Road and past that intersection for the ETTT Rail to run in the form of a

tunnel, swinging right under Pennant Hills Road to meet at Pennant Hills/Thornleigh Station at the proposed tunnel for ETTT at Pennant Hills. The Federal Funding provision could be disbursed for this purpose, the Rail Routes being on a common Alignment for about 4kms. The NWRL GEOTECHNICAL LONG SECTION depicted in Section 1 OF 9 (Figure B2) founded in HAWKESBURY SANDSTONE seems to favour such an arrangement. The grade for the Freight Rail is below the acceptable grade.

- d) There appears to be little or no Safeguard against likely incidents of Bush Fire for the long 15km length of twin tunnel between Epping and Bella Vista. This is particularly important in light of the impending Climate Change and Green House Gas Emissions that could endanger life along this terrain and vegetation. Tunnel ventilation and ventilation failures should be addressed at the beginning.
- e) Sustainability features for the sections with Viaducts and Bridges need to be chosen to capture Solar and Wind Power combined with Noise abatement and Vibration reduction measures.
- f) The inevitable change at Epping station and Chatswood station can cause concerns to persons with disability, safety as well as capacity problems, particularly when the Rail Link is operated and maintained by a private operator, on an expected 37 minutes schedule between Cudgegong Road Station to Chatswood. I would suggest that a link be provided just before Chatswood, like the one approved for EPRL at Epping. This opens up the future possibility of creating a separate underground Rail Link from Chatswood to CBD and Central/Redfern with a second Harbour crossing, as and when required, independently or connected to Hornsby Line.

Also, the absence of any Parking provision for NWRL at Epping will cause undesirable congestion in Epping and surrounds and clog up the approach to the planned Epping Town Centre development as well as the Road system including M2 approaches.

Given the opportunity, I can spare some time to clarify what I had made as a written Submission, but would request that my name be NOT made available for publication.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

EPPING NSW 2121

[REDACTED]