

**Subject:** Submission on SSI 15\_7400

**Description:** Sydenham Station and Sydney Metro Trains Facility South

**Date:** 08-Aug-17

I am objecting to the current concept for Sydenham station and the metro Facility South as detailed in Modification Report Summary – June 2017 for the following reasons detailed below:

#### Metro Platform Schematic

The modification report summary shows people crossing a platform between a metro and Sydney train and the suggestion is this is Sydenham. This is shown on the front cover and in the schematic on page 13 and again on page 14. Clearly shown on page 15 and 19 is the real plan, the metro platform being to the north east of the existing platforms. It is my understanding from visiting the public display that the metro platforms cannot be curved, which platform 1 and 2 currently are. This requires new platforms to the NE of the existing platform 1 and 2.

Although my objection is because the description is clearly wrong, I am also objecting because the design needs a lot more work to be viable, and I do not believe there is sufficient space available to include the 2 platforms, the shunt platform and the stations services building, as well as the interchange with Railway Parade in the area designated.

#### Poor Design

The idea that people will willingly exit from the T2 and T4 trains at Sydenham<sup>1</sup> to change to a metro train when the change involves a significant walk, at worse from the SW end of the existing platforms, over the existing elevated concourse, then north east to the end of the existing platform 1, to go toward the city and beyond, needs to be reviewed in depth.

The location of the new Metro platforms is in the wrong place.

The shunt facility should be the full length of a metro train, to provide a turnback in future, so that a reduced frequency of trains can be timetabled west to Bankstown, whilst maintaining a higher frequency to the city.

Without having the technical skills to examine detailed engineering and geotechnical plans, it would appear that the location of the metro platforms must be located further towards the city than shown, as there is insufficient width of the corridor to accommodate the metro platforms, avoid issues with the main open very large drains and spillway to the SW of the Sydenham drainage pit. Furthermore it would appear that having room between the pit and the metro tracks, plus the shunt track, as well as a fence and both the metro and existing Sydney Train tracks will require platform 6 to be straightened and for these existing train tracks to be relocated in an easterly direction.

#### Enclosure of existing open water spillways and other storm water facilities

The design does not address the predicted, and, some scientists say, already more intense rain storms occurring as a result of climate change. Simply enclosing these spillways is not enough. They will be under parts of the new metro line, which may be subject to inundation in severe rainstorms, as the enclosed spillways reach their limit. This will put further pressure on the existing tunnel under Railway Parade and the Botany Goods Line.

---

<sup>1</sup> The same issue will exist initially when the T3 trains terminate at Sydenham, then at Bankstown, namely getting people to walk up to the length of 2 platforms to change trains.

### Trains Facility South

The drawing on P21 is very confusing as it shows the 2 main Metro tracks proceeding to the Marrickville Dive, which I presume is the tunnel to Waterloo, but one track coming out of the marshalling yard and joining the existing corridor to St Peters.

This contradicts the stated need to maintain separate right of way for the Metro.

### XPT Facility and Phase 1 Operations

During the public exhibition, I asked about the future of the XPT facility. I was told that it was hoped it would be relocated. I understand from my local member, who is the secretary to the transport minister, that the aging XPT fleet will be replaced with similar train sets. Therefore it would be very expensive to both replace the XPT fleet and relocate their service facility.

I do not think enough planning has been done to incorporate the XPT facility or the XPT train operational requirements into this design.

The schematic on page 13 shows that for both XPT trains and T3 trains which currently use platforms 1 and 2 will use the tracks passing platforms 3 & 4, while the tracks on platforms 1 & 2 are converted to Metro.

My observations of the junction to the SW of these platforms will have excessive curves and not be conducive to good train operation.

The phase 1 schematic also refers to freight operations, although I suspect this is an error.

### Future Extensions

The underlying assumption for the future expansion of the metro is that it will go to Bankstown and there appears no consideration for any other spurs. It would seem sensible to incorporate the ability to extend the metro to the nearest higher density areas, being the Woolli Creek, Arncliffe, Banksia and Rockdale precinct, plus the Wolli Creek, Turella and Bardwell Park precinct.

### Alternative platform location

The ideal location would be under the existing platforms, which will make it much easier to change from T2 or T4 trains to the metro, but this is likely to be technically challenging to build safely, for a reasonable cost and to allow metro trains to access the Metro Facility South at ground level. The low flight path at Sydenham excludes building the metro platforms above the existing platforms.

The next option is to consider building it in Railway Parade, by elevating the existing roadway above the station. This may facilitate a tunnel to the SW for future spur lines from Sydenham.

This needs to be incorporated into this phase and the design and platform location re-visited before proceeding as currently planned.

### Removing Bottleneck

On page 10, it states that the T3 Bankstown slows down the network because of the way it merges with T2 Airport line, Inner West and South line. Whilst it is possible at Central for trains to do this, the current train operation only has the T3 Bankstown line sharing track with a limited T2 service from Campbelltown prior to Central, and the rest of the T2 line after Central station.

Removing the T3 trains will not solve the capacity links on the T2 airport line, because other services will need to be supplied to service St Peters and Erskineville. What is needed is the original design of 6 tracks (or in the interim a dual directional 5<sup>th</sup> track) between Sydenham and to after the T4 tunnel to Redfern at Erskineville as well as the proposed Metro link. The increased track(s) will allow express trains to overtake stopping trains resolving a part of the bottleneck that exists today.

There is currently very little incentive for Bankstown line passengers to change trains at Sydenham during peak hour, because both the T2 (particularly) and most T4 trains either, do not stop, or, if they do, are already full by the time they reach Sydenham during peak hour. The design at Sydenham plus the lack of capacity on the existing network appears to be designed to ensure T3 passengers continue on to Central before changing from the Metro to the existing network to access Museum, St James or Circular Quay stations.

There is no provision for T2 passengers boarding between Padstow and Turella to utilise the Metro without changing trains twice, at Wolli Creek and Sydenham, based on the present operations of the T2 line.

Although I am opposed to the current design for the reasons above, I do agree with the concept of splitting the South West Metro into 2 phases, so that the Central to Sydenham can operate whilst the Sydenham to Bankstown section can be built later. However, there are significant issues with the proposed plan for Sydenham, which can be simplified if the Sydenham to Bankstown and other high density local precincts are properly planned.

It is not appropriate in this submission to discuss the extension to Bankstown, but it makes more sense to terminate the T3 trains at Sydenham and not continue on to Bankstown.

### Conclusion

This is a state significant development but it has a poor design, with incorrect public material being displayed, and no future planning. These are the reasons why I oppose this proposal.