

Tracy Bellamy - Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Project- SS1 5132

From: Faye and John Hughes <jofahu1@bigpond.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 5/11/2012 10:31 AM
Subject: Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Project- SS1 5132
CC: <office@bereklian.minister.new.gov.au>

Director – Infrastructure Projects
 NSW Dept of Planning and Infrastructure

Dear sir/madam

We are making this submission re the expansion of the third track between Epping and Thornleigh. We have made previous submissions re this project and we attended the information session on 10 October at the Cheltenham Recreational Club and met and discussed various aspects of the Project with members of the project team.

As a first point it is clear the decision to proceed with the third track has already been made by Government. The point of this submission is to gain clarity and understanding as to how certain aspects of this expanded piece of infrastructure will be managed, controlled and the impact on the local Beecroft community and amenity is minimised.

It was disappointing to find that notwithstanding the detailed EIS material provided at the October 10 meeting the project team could not identify what land would be lost between the Copeland rd bridge and the pedestrian rail underpass. There are clearly many substantial old trees in this area, the village green and a children's playground that is very heavily utilised. There appeared to be lots of discussion/views as to how the car parking would be retained yet the team or the maps could not provide clarity on the more important impacts on the Beecroft Village amenity. The Beecroft Cheltenham area is a Heritage Conservation Area and the rail plan appears not to address this issue. The residents are obligated to protect this Heritage factor when they modify their residences, yet the Government appears not to have addressed this important issue in the EIS. Could you clarify how this important aspect is being addressed and precisely how the area of landed identified in this paragraph will be impacted, trees protected and Village amenity retained.

It is difficult to understand how the EIS can be considered prior to further community clarity on this important issue.

The most disturbing aspect of the current rail corridor is the train noise created by the freight trains 24 hrs per day. Clearly the need for the rail expansion is for additional train movements and we can only expect the current noise issue to be expanded. We live approximately 500 metres from the rail corridor and expect to hear trains in the area. We first moved to Beecroft in 1996 and the noise pollution has increased by a very large factor since then. Given the rail positioning hasn't changed over this period it suggests several factors :

- Rail tracks have not been appropriately serviced and maintained
- Train sets are not maintained appropriately by the govt and non govt owners
- Trains sets are carrying extra weight inappropriate for the corridor and the curvature of the track.

The rail project team provided information at the meeting about the noise surveys/recordings being undertaken at present, however, they could provide no clarity as to the cause of the noise pollution. More concerning is how the current noise and additional noise from further traffic will be monitored and controlled.

Notwithstanding the recordings and surveys to identify the magnitude of the problem (which I am sure most of the local residents could explain quite easily to the Rail Team) we need to understand **what is going to be done to control and police this noise pollution 24 hrs per day?** Residential communities have noise standards that are clearly understood and policed by Council and the Police. What is the position with the Rail users and

infrastructure providers ? The EIS needs to identify acceptable community noise levels during normal working hours (7am to 6pm) and lower noise levels overnight to ensure the community can appropriately enjoy their sleep. More importantly the EIS should ensure the noise levels are closely monitored and the cause of the noise pollution addressed as necessary. If the track bends need correcting to accommodate new rolling stock and/or carrying loads or the train sets limited to certain loads for certain times of days then the EIS needs to ensure changes are approved and must be implemented. Additionally the EIS needs to address how noise pollution caused by Government owned infrastructure is appropriately managed and controlled by an independent authority not associated with the owners of the rail track or rolling stock. The EIS should set appropriate noise pollution standards per train movement and breaches of this standard will require remedial action by the owners of this infrastructure. Continued breaches of these standards should result in fines and non use of the infrastructure by the offending rolling stock owners on the corridor.

The Community should have access to such an independent body for formal submission of complaints and the body must have Authority and jurisdiction over the providers of the Rail infrastructure and rolling stock to ensure corrective action can be enforced and the noise problems addressed efficiently.

Thank you for your attention and I look forward to receiving clarity as to how these changes will be addressed.
(Not a token massed produced feelgood letter!)

Yours faithfully

R J & F J Hughes
147 Copeland Rd East
Beecroft 2119