

Submission Form

Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Proposal. Application number SSI 5132.

Name(s):

BORAL P. BLAIR

Address:

192 COPELAND Rd East BEECROFT

I/we object to the Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Proposal and consider that the EIS is inadequate and does not address the full impact of this proposal. It will cause untold damage to the health of residents and to the fabric of the Beecroft Cheltenham Heritage Conservation Area. Do not approve this project, reconsider the alternatives and protect the community.

No Government Regulation of Noise and Pollution from these trains.

- The EIS does not address the impact on noise of the real potential increase in rail freight traffic beyond the current projected increase from 29 to 41 movements a day thereby avoiding the legislated need for a reassessment of noise levels.
- An independent study has shown current rail noise levels result in some 2 to 3 sleep disturbances a night where 1 is normal for reasons other than noise. Noise frequency will increase with increased traffic and is unacceptable.
- The same study showed that highest noise levels peaks occurred between 10pm and 6am, seven days a week.
- Sleep disturbance is recognised as a significant stress factor which impairs health and wellbeing.
- The EIS does not address the known health issues in the community resulting from increased rail freight namely coal dust from uncovered wagons and diesel particulate matter, a known carcinogen.
- These private freight operators should be subjected to legislative controls which protect the community and be forced to upgrade to modern high powered trains which would avoid the need for this third track.

Heritage

- There has been inadequate assessment of the project's impact on the fabric of the Beecroft Cheltenham Heritage Conservation Area (HCA).
- The plan given for Beecroft Railway station Precinct is vague. The relationship to the trees, playground and original 1895 platform located south of the present station is not shown. A fourth track is shown on the eastern side. The plan does not include urgently needed lifts to allow disabled access at Beecroft Station.
- Beecroft Station Gardens have a heritage listing with Hornsby Council but the impact on them has not been adequately addressed. No arborist's report is given for the trees which will be removed.
- The proposed redevelopment of Cheltenham Station shows no regard for the HCA. The visual impact of the proposed 13m high glass and steel concourse is totally unacceptable in this HCA.
- There has been little or inadequate consideration of Aboriginal archaeology in the area.
- No evaluation has been made of the type of engineering structures and aesthetic finishes which are suitable and compatible for a HCA. This includes retaining walls, embankments, revetments and culverts. Shotcrete is not an acceptable finish in a HCA. This matter should be addressed now in the EIS.

Vegetation

- The EIS is relying on vegetation to lessen the impact of the project on heritage houses and the fabric of the HCA whilst depleting and failing to restore and replenish the vegetation in the rail corridor.
- Depletion of the vegetation has an impact on the amenity of residents immediately adjacent to the corridor.
- Existing vegetation will not reduce the noise impact. A thicket 30m deep is needed to reduce noise by 1dB.

Reduction in Road Traffic

- Claims that the project will reduce road freight are not substantiated. As total freight increases, road freight will also increase. A study published to support another piece of public infrastructure states that 'rail is unlikely to meet the future inter-regional transport task even if major rail infrastructure upgrades occur'. (SKM report F3 to Sydney Orbital Link Study, April (2004).
- Rail freight is for long distance transport of goods. Road freight is for local transport and perishable goods.

Do not approve this project. Protect the Community from these impacts. Impose restrictions on private rail operators.

Signature(s)

Send to: The Director – Infrastructure Projects, Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Project - SSI 5132, NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure, GPO Box 39, Sydney 2001 or plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au or fax 9228 6455 before Monday 5 November 2012.

Vegetation Will Not Screen the Impact

The EIS is relying on vegetation to lessen the impact of the project on heritage houses and the fabric of the HCA whilst at the same time depleting and failing to restore and replenish the vegetation in the rail corridor. Depletion of the vegetation will have an impact on the amenity of residents immediately adjacent to the corridor. Existing vegetation will not reduce the noise impact. A thicket 30m deep is needed to reduce noise by 1dB.

Ignoring our Health - No Government Control on Noise and Pollution

There is no Government agency responsible for noise and pollution in NSW. BCCT commissioned an independent acoustic report which found that 'noise impacts from existing rail movements have a significant adverse impact on the acoustic amenity of residences near the railway. The main impact is at night. Existing railway movements would typically cause around 2 to 3 awakenings per night whereas the typical number of awakenings at night for the general population for reasons other than noise is around 1 awakening'. It concluded 'the adverse effect on sleep is significant'. Sleep disturbance is a recognised stress and is known to impair health. Increased numbers of freight trains will increase the frequency of noise disturbances on top of 'an already unacceptable level'.

The EIS has not adequately considered any future potential increases in rail freight traffic above the current estimate of 41 movements a day. This is likely to occur with the ETTT and any further increase would require a total reassessment of the project.

The EIS lacks equity in not considering the high social costs of this project and integrity arising from inadequate assessment of noise impacts. Approval should be rejected on these two grounds alone.

Given the delays now associated with the Newcastle coal loader, there is also likely to be an increase in the number of coal trains through our suburbs taking coal to Port Kembla. The EIS does not address the known health issues in the community resulting from increased rail freight namely coal dust from uncovered wagons and diesel particulate matter, a known carcinogen.

These private freight operators should be subjected to legislative controls which protect the community. They should be forced to upgrade to modern high powered locomotives which would avoid the need for this third track.

It Will Not Reduce Road Freight on Pennant Hills Road

Claims that the project will reduce road freight are not substantiated. Rail freight is used for long distance freight of a non-perishable nature between ports and distribution centres - in our case, mostly between Melbourne or Sydney and Brisbane. Road freight is mainly for perishable goods and for shorter, more direct journeys between the distributors and end users. These cannot be made by rail. As total rail freight increases, road freight will also increase. A study published to support another piece of public infrastructure states that 'rail is unlikely to meet the future inter-regional transport task even if major rail infrastructure upgrades occur'. (SKM report *F3 to Sydney Orbital Link Study*, April (2004). The ETTT is not intended to arrest the growth in road freight and it cannot.

What You Can Do

If you missed the Information Sessions held on Weds 10 Oct at Cheltenham Recreation Club, 5 – 8pm and Sat 20 Oct at Beecroft Community Centre, 10am – 1pm, you can look at the EIS. It is available at Hornsby Council, Hornsby Library, Pennant Hills Library and Epping Library or on line at www.transport.nsw.gov.au (go to Development Assessment at bottom of page, click 'on exhibition', then on Main North Rail Line, Epping to Thornleigh Third Track).

Most importantly, make a submission before 5 November.


Write your own submission or copy and sign the submission on the last page of this Bulletin and mail it to the address below. You may also drop it in to Ray White Beecroft by Thursday 1 November.

Submissions close on **Monday 5 November**. They must include:

1. Your name and address
2. The proposal name – Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Proposal
3. Application number SSI 5132
4. A statement whether you support or reject the proposals
5. Reasons why you support or reject the proposal.

Submissions are to be sent to: Director – Infrastructure Projects, Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Project – SSI 5132
NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure, GPO Box 39, Sydney 2001 or by email to plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au or fax to 9228 6455

Copy your submission to the Minister for Planning and our local MPs Philip Ruddock and Greg Smith :
office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au; philip.ruddock@aph.gov.au; office@smith.minister.nsw.gov.au



BEECROFT CHELTENHAM CIVIC TRUST INC

PO Box 31, Beecroft NSW 2119

www.2119.org.au

bcct2119.blogspot.com

BULLETIN 4

October 2012

President
Email

Michael Stove
mstove@optusnet.com.au

Acting Secretary
Email

Peter Hewitt
secretary@2119.org.au

BCCT was established in 1964 and has been protecting our community for 48 years.

Special Issue - Epping to Thornleigh Third Track Oppose this Project which will destroy Beecroft and Cheltenham A Submission Form for you to sign is on Page 4

What is wrong with the Epping to Thornleigh Third Track (ETTT) Proposal

This project is being forced on the suburbs of Beecroft and Cheltenham by the Federal Government which has allocated \$840mil to its cost. The State Government is allocating some \$200mil to it whilst stripping much needed funds from Education and Health.

The Environmental Impact Study (EIS) has serious defects. The ETTT lies within the Beecroft Cheltenham Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) yet little regard has been given in the EIS to the HCA in assessing the project's impact. The EIS only considers a distance of 50 m from the track and 'impact' seems to imply visual impact. The EIS states that the third track will *'not have a significant negative impact on the heritage values of the HCA'*. The fabric of the HCA has been ignored.

The impacts on the community as a whole will be significant. The community will be subject to noise and health impairing pollution. Vegetation will be removed and our heritage will be severely compromised.

The Government seems determined to impose this devastation on our Community just so the freight trains, with their old, noisy, polluting, inefficient diesel locomotives, run by private operators, can move their 1.5km long trains more easily between Epping and Pennant Hills up the second highest gradient in the rail network and around curves designed for trains in the 1890s. The Government is not prepared to impose noise and pollution regulations on these trains nor force the private operators to upgrade their locomotives.

What is wrong with the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

The EIS is full of contradictions and deficiencies. It seems to be framed to support the proposal as a pre-determined outcome. Some areas that affect us include:

Ignoring our Heritage

Proposed Cheltenham Railway Station




Figure 5.5 Artist's impression of new elevated concourse at Cheltenham Station looking south from The Crescent (indicated circle)




Figure 5.6 Cross-section and elevation - New Cheltenham Station concourse building
Note: Indicatively added to future design

The ETTT proposal imposes a two storey, 13m high, railway concourse at Cheltenham to be positioned near the entrance to the current car park. It will have lift and stair access to all platforms, a bus bay and taxi rank. The indicative design shown in the EIS is a glass and steel structure. This is totally inappropriate for a Heritage Conservation Area and indicates that the designers either ignored or were unaware of the HCA. The only time buses come to Cheltenham Station is when they are replacing rail. There has never been a taxi rank at Cheltenham, nor any need for one.

The EIS considers that this huge structure is *'unlikely to have significant impacts on the heritage values'* of the houses opposite, mainly because some of them will be screened by vegetation.

The car park on the western side will be extended almost to Lyne Road which will increase walking distance and impact on the Cheltenham Recreation Club. Parking in The Crescent adjacent to the station is removed.

There has been little or inadequate consideration of aboriginal artefacts known to be in the area.

Rock will be removed from the cutting under the western side of the road bridge which will be strengthened.

Why is this work proposed for such a quiet station when little enhancement is proposed for the much busier Beecroft station?




Figure 5.3 Future Cheltenham Station layout

Note: Indicative only, subject to detailed design

Beecroft Station

The historic original platform, built in 1895 and opened when the railway came in 1896, is to be removed. This is located south of the station near the Community Centre. It represents the earliest piece of rail infrastructure in Beecroft. Land sales commenced in the following year.

Some changes will be made to extend the subway under the third track, but these should be in keeping with its unique heritage status. There are still no plans for lifts or other facilities to allow much needed disabled access at Beecroft.

It will be necessary to make the cutting on the western side of the station wider and remove a section of the children's playground and gardens, including 2 of the 6 historic Bunya Pines. No Arborist Report is included. No details are given as to the amount of land to be removed or the profile and finishes for the new cutting to make it compatible for a HCA.

The car park will be extended, but it is fanciful to believe that the study found 300 available car parking spaces on a week day, within 400 m of the station. Commuters would like to know where they are.

It is claimed that houses located in Wongala Cres and Sutherland Rd and nearby streets will *'not be impacted because they are screened by vegetation'*.