Appendix C

Non-government submissions

Table C TIDC's response to non-government submissions received during the exhibition period

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
1	1	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Will there be a bus service that operates between Existing and New Schofields stations?	A Schofields Station Transition Plan (as discussed in Section 3.2.1) will be developed in cooperation with the Ministry of Transport (MoT), RailCorp, TIDC and the Strategies and Land Release Branch for the management of issues pertaining to the reconfiguration of one or both of the existing bus routes and provision of pedestrian access to the new station, including footpaths, street lighting and road access to the new station. Additionally, as described in Section 8.3.4 of the Environmental Assessment, the MoT is currently reviewing the existing metropolitan bus services in accordance with the recommendations of the Unsworth Review and as part of the MoT's yearly service review. The longer term development of bus services is envisaged to provide transport services for new release areas in the vicinity of the Richmond Rail Line, especially with regard to the Alex Avenue, Schofields and Riverstone East precincts. These longer term bus services are envisaged to provide connections from the existing Schofields township and surrounding new development to the proposed new Schofields Station.
1	2	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Would prefer that Schofields Station is not relocated.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of this report provides an overview of the justification for the relocation of Schofields Station.
2	3	Approvals process	Stage 2	Project information infers that the development of Stage 2 will be inevitable, which is not the case.	As described in Section 6.1 of the Environmental Assessment, the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication (referred to as the Project) Environmental Assessment seeks project approval for both Stages of the Project. As such, Stages 1 and 2 of the Project may proceed if the Minister for Planning grants Project approval for the Project; however the delivery of Stage 2 has been deferred to align with growth in the North West Growth Centre (NWGC). A review of the Environmental Assessment will be undertaken if Stage 2 does not commence within 5 years. Statement of Commitment number 53 (refer Chapter 6): *if Stage 2 of the Project is not commenced within 5 years of Project Approval, a review of the Environmental Assessment will be completed to determine if any elements of the assessment should be revisited and updated. This shall take into account any changes to the existing environment, and consideration as to whether the predicted impacts and proposed mitigation*

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					measures as set out in the Environmental Assessment remain valid. The review and any applicable updates of the assessment shall be completed prior to the commencement of construction of Stage 2 works. Ongoing consultation with various agencies will occur for Stage 2 to further plans for the NWGC.
2	4	Constructability	Stage 2	The construction of Stage 2 after the commissioning of Stage 1 will prolong the inconvenience to rail commuters. As such the Project should be constructed as a single activity to avoid unnecessary disruption.	The impacts related to construction will be dependant on the location of the construction works and activities taking place during the construction phase for both Stage 1 and 2 of the Project, therefore different construction impacts will be experienced by different receivers. Stage 1 and 2 would each take approximately 24 months to complete. Based on the information available to date, it is not envisaged that the construction timeframe for Stage 2 would be longer. The Project, if completed as one stage from Quakers Hill to Vineyard, is expected to take 48 months.
3	5	Project design	Pedestrian and cyclist provisions	Confirmation as to whether a footpath will be provided on the eastern side of the Railway Corridor between the existing and new Schofields Stations along Railway Terrace.	As described in Section 6.2.6 of the Environmental Assessment and Section 3.2.1 of this report, a shared user path (pedestrian/cyclist) would be provided along Railway Terrace to connect the existing Schofields Station site with the new Schofields Station. This shared user path would be delivered as part of Stage 1 of the Project. An indicative illustration of the shared user path is shown in Figure 4-3 (refer Section 4.2.3), subject to detailed design. The design of the shared user path would incorporate Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles to manage potential safety and security issues. Such measures would include appropriate lighting and landscaping treatments to increase passive surveillance. Lighting is proposed to be provided along the entire length of the shared user path and would be designed in accordance with *AS1158 Lighting for roads and public spaces*. The detailed design of the shared user path would be developed as part of the Transition Plan and in consultation with Blacktown City Council (BCC) and the Strategies and Land Release Branch.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
3	6	Project design	Road works	Confirmation of road works planned on the western side of the corridor that will be provided to service Schofield's residents on the southern side of the line.	A new access road to Schofields Station is proposed to be constructed from the end of Bridge Street. This access road would provide vehicle and pedestrian access to the commuter car park and station located on the western side of the rail corridor. Access on the western side (via Bridge Street) was incorporated as a result of community concerns and requests for access on the western side at a community meeting held in 2008. The Project proposes to provide on the western side: ▪ replacement of the existing pedestrian level crossing at the existing station with a pedestrian footbridge ▪ a kiss-and-ride facility at the new Schofields Station ▪ a new 120 space at-grade car park adjacent the new Schofields Station Street ▪ stairs and lift access to the station from the western side, in addition to a raised pedestrian rail crossing. Pedestrian and cyclist access across the rail corridor would be maintained during construction as the existing pedestrian level crossing would remain open during construction of the new footbridge. The new footbridge would be completed before the pedestrian level crossing would be decommissioned as part of Stage 1. Further detail regarding construction impacts on the road network as a result of the Project is provided in Chapter 3 and Section 3.3 of the Environmental Assessment's Technical Paper 1 – Traffic and Transport.
4	7	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Relocation of Schofields Station is contrary to the wishes of the existing community, who did not want the station moved.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of this report provides an overview of the justification for the relocation of Schofields Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
4	8	Socio-economic	Business viability	Decommissioning the existing Schofields Station will have a negative impact on local businesses.	It is likely that the relocation of Schofields Station will result in both positive and negative economic impacts to local businesses in the area. Section 3.2.1 of the report (refer to *Sub-issue 3 – socio-economic impacts*) provides a response regarding the impacts to businesses. The Strategies and Land Release Branch (formerly GCC) is currently preparing plans for the revitalisation of the Schofields village centre as part of the development of the NWGC. It is expected that the revitalisation of Schofields village centre will reinforce its role as a neighbourhood centre within the Riverstone precinct. A revitalised village centre would likely lead to sustained or increased patronage for existing businesses.
4	9	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Decommissioning the existing Schofields Station will have a negative impact on ease of access to the existing station, especially for the elderly and mothers with kids.	As described in Section 8.2.2 of the Environmental Assessment, the relocation of Schofields Station would have a greater impact on existing residents who currently access Schofield's station by walking and cycling and live north of the existing station. Section 3.2.1 of the report (refer to *Sub-issue 1 – Accessibility*) provides a response regarding the impacts to station accessibility and discusses the implementation of the shared user path, western side access to the station and the various design elements that have been incorporated into the stations design to improve access. Additionally, please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1) regarding the *Schofields Station Transition Plan* which discusses future bus services between the existing and new Schofields Station.
4	10	Project design	Footbridge design	The proposed design of the footbridge at Schofields is inadequate for the elderly to walk up multiple ramps to a height of eight metres.	Section 5.5.1 of the report provides a description of the Schofields Footbridge concept design, as modified since the exhibition of the Environmental Assessment. The location of the pedestrian footbridge is now at the existing Schofields Station site rather than the existing pedestrian level crossing. The detailed design of the footbridge has reduced lengths of the sloping ramps (excluding the horizontal bridge over the track) by approx 100m. This recent design modification has therefore resulted in a significant reduction in ramp journey distance and time to cross.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					The pedestrian footbridges have been designed to comply with the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* and conform to easy access standards. Ramps have been included in the design (as opposed to stairs) as they facilitate easy access across the railway corridor. While the use of ramps will increase the walking distance (relative to current access arrangements) this is not expected to be significant.
4	11	Socio-economic	Equality	The needs of future communities cannot be adequately represented with the Project and consultation should be undertaken with new home owners.	The Project has taken into consideration the Strategies and Land Release Branch plans for the NWGC, which assumes a significant population expansion in this area over the next 25 years. This project proposes to improve the rail infrastructure to accommodate this rapid expansion of residential development over the next 25 years. Stage 1 of the Project will be completed by 2011 if approval is granted in late 2009. Stage 2 of the Project is likely to take place in parallel with the development of NWGC. The project has been specifically designed to cater for these future communities in addition to increasing services for existing residents. TIDC will continue to consult with the Strategies and Land Release Branch throughout the detailed design and delivery of Stages 1 and 2 of the Project as to the plans for the NWGC.
4	12	Socio-economic	Equality	Moving Schofields Station panders to developers and greed, not people.	Section 3.2.2 of the report provides an overview of the justification of the relocation of Schofields Station. This justification demonstrates that the relocation of Schofields Station has been proposed for a number of reasons, including the anticipated NWGC development which has been detailed in precinct planning reports for Alex Avenue via the Strategies and Land Release Branch. The predicted development of the NWGC is part of the NSW Government's growth centre's strategy to accommodate future population growth and expected housing demand for metropolitan Sydney. The NWGC is within the boundaries of three local government areas over approximately 10,000 hectares and the NSW Government plans to accommodate 70,000 new homes within 16 precincts of the NWGC.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
5	13	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	Why does Schofields Station have to be relocated away from existing residences and local shops?	Section 3.2.2 of the report provides an overview of the justification of the relocation of Schofields Station. The Strategies and Land Release Branch fact sheets on the Alex Avenue and Riverstone precinct plans show that the layout of the new communities will ensure residents are generally within a five minute walk of bus stops or a rail station, noting that the mix in housing types in locations across the Precincts will provide for different needs, different incomes and aims to make the best use of parks, drainage lands and other environmental constraints. Refer to Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 1*) of the report regarding the Schofields Station Transition Plan. The option of upgrading Schofields Station at the existing location was not considered feasible due to various reasons including the close proximity of residences and commercial premises restricting the availability of land required to configure station platforms and associated infrastructure required as part of the duplication works. Relocating the station avoids these constructability issues and reduces the need to compulsorily acquire properties. In addition to the benefits and justification provided in Section 3.2.2 of the report, the relocation of Schofields Stations will improve access, parking facilities and connections to buses for the wider community. The Riverstone precinct plan notes that the planned higher density housing will be concentrated along public transport corridors, with most homes to be within 400 metres of public transport.
5	14	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Most of the local residents walk to the Schofields Station and will have to drive or purchase a car or bike in order to access the new station.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9) regarding accessibility impacts. TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5) provides detail on the shared user path that will be provided on the eastern side of the rail corridor between the existing Schofields Station and the new Schofields Station. TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1) provides detail on the *Schofields Station Transition Plan* which would address future bus services between the existing and new Schofield Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
5	15	Public safety	Relocation of Schofields Station	Relocating Schofields Station away from houses and shops will increase the risk of cars being stolen or broken into, as well as increase the risk that people (especially kids and the elderly) will be hassled during the night time and early mornings.	TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5) provides detail on the shared user path that will be provided on the eastern side of the rail corridor between the existing Schofields Station and the new Schofields Station. Pedestrian access to the new Schofields Station from the existing station would also be provided from the western side of the rail corridor. An indicative illustration of the shared user path (also referred to as footpath) is shown in Figure 4-3 (refer Section 4.2.3). Section 3.2.1 also provides detail on the shared user path and the design of the shared user path incorporating Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles to manage potential safety and security issues. Such measures would include appropriate lighting and landscaping treatments to permit passive surveillance. The principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) would also be applied to the new Schofields Station and car park. This includes appropriate lighting, fencing of the rail corridor, installation of surveillance cameras and help points. These would be included as part of the detailed design process and would be based on similar measures at existing rail stations in the Sydney rail network. As part of the proposed Riverstone and Alex Avenue precinct plans, residential development (to include 15,000 new dwellings) will occur around the relocated Schofields Station, which will change the area. in the future. TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 13) provides further detail on the residential development to be created surrounding the relocated Schofields Station.
5	16	Consultation	Project design	TIDC need to listen to the local residents and keep the existing station in situ.	As described in Section 3.2.2 (*refer sub-issue2*) of the report, the Project has followed the prescribed legislated process under the EP&A Act and has conducted adequate consultation with the local community, government and non-government agencies during the planning approval process (as shown in Figure 1-2 of this report). The relocation of Schofields Station has been dealt with in Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.1 of this report.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
5	17	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Provide another station for local areas such as Rouse Hill and Kellyville instead of relocating Schofields Station.	The purpose of this project is to improve and upgrade rail infrastructure on the existing Richmond Line, including duplication of the track from 150m north of Quakers Hill Station to Vineyard Station. The duplication of track provides the impetus of this Project and the current proposal represents a 'whole-of-government' approach to facilitate this improvement of rail infrastructure for the NWGC. The provision of a new rail corridor, track and stations at Kellyville and surrounding areas is outside the scope of this Project.
5	18	Public safety	Relocation of Schofields Station	Relocation of Schofields Station will increase serious security risks to the locals.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 15) and submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5) for discussion on public safety issues and measures to be included in the design of the shared user path (respectively).
6	19	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	Concern that Quakers Hill has the largest number of commuters using this station currently but there are no plans within this project to upgrade this station particularly disabled access facilities, kiss-and-ride spaces, parking facilities, ticket booths.	The purpose of this project is to duplicate the existing single line sections of track between Vineyard and north of Quakers Hill and associated station facilities and upgrades Various works are being proposed for Quakers Hill Station, separate to this duplication Project. RailCorp are progressing plans for an Easy Access upgrade of Quakers Hill Station and the NSW Government has announced a new car park at Quakers Hill. **Easy Access Station Upgrade** The upgrade will consist of a new station concourse, three new lifts and a new platform building containing booking office, staff facilities and a family accessible toilet. The Easy Access Upgrade would see the proposed pedestrian footbridge incorporated into the proposed Easy Access Upgrade at Quakers Hill Station. Concept plans are currently being finalised by RailCorp. Tender for detailed design is due to be awarded in August 2009. Construction is currently scheduled to commence in May 2010, with completion expected towards the end of 2011. In the event that the Quakers Hill Station Easy Access Upgrade was not completed before commissioning of the project, pedestrian access across the rail line would still be maintained.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					Commuter Car Park Program On the 19 January 2009, NSW Minister for Transport David Campbell announced a new commuter car park will be built at Quakers Hill as part of the NSW Government's $56 million Commuter Car Park program, delivering an estimated 200 car spaces. Detailed investigation of potential sites is currently underway, with construction expected to begin in 2010. It is expected that the car park will be completed in 2011.
7	20	Non-Indigenous heritage	Riverstone Station	Historical buildings like the old Station Masters Home should be kept.	As described in Section 8.5.2 of the Environmental Assessment, the Project would not have a direct physical impact on the Station Masters residence; however the Project will have a direct impact on platforms 1 and 2 at Riverstone Station. These impacts would involve minor modifications of the platform structure and would not significantly alter its component fabric or function. Direct physical effects on heritage listed buildings in Riverstone Railway Station and Yard Group have been avoided through the design of the proposed pedestrian footbridge. The pedestrian footbridge was designed to be physically separated from the heritage items in the Riverstone Station precinct in consultation with the Heritage Branch of DoP. The proposed upgrade works at Riverstone Station would retain this heritage item as a functioning component of the rail network. The proposed upgrade works at Riverstone Station would see contemporary aesthetics successfully placed beside the existing heritage items, such as the Stationmaster's Cottage, resulting in the individual elements associated with the relevant eras of the buildings being more distinct. Further information on cultural heritage impacts of the Project is provided in Section 8.5 of the Environmental Assessment. Additionally, ongoing consultation regarding the location of the footbridge will continue with the RTA and Strategies and Land Release Branch. Refer to TIDC's response to ref 48 and 60 in Table D (refer Appendix D).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
7	21	Project design	Station design, visual treatments and landscaping	Upgrade of Stations is necessary; however station design should be in keeping with the history of the area.	The new stations have been designed in accordance with RailCorp's *Station Design Standard Requirements* (July 2008). Further refinement of design will occur during detailed design, in consultation with agencies such as the Heritage Office (for Riverstone Station in particular), Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA. The heritage assessment that was undertaken for the Project concluded that the proposed upgrade works at Riverstone Station would not substantially compromise the integrity of the existing heritage listed buildings in the station precinct. Best practice heritage management and design philosophies do not advocate the mimicking of past architectural styles when adding new components into existing heritage precincts. Creation of faux heritage structures effectively devalues the significance of the genuine heritage fabric. While the modern design of the new stations may be in contrast with the surrounding rural landscape (Schofields/Vineyard) and/or existing Riverstone Station in the short-term, it is expected that in the long-term, the visual impacts associated with the new stations would be minimal as a result of the overall redevelopment of the receiving areas. It is expected that future land uses would integrate with the new stations, and as such the contrast between the new stations and the surrounding land use would be reduced. The provision of modern stations would be in keeping with the planned development of the NWGC.
7	22	Project design	Station design, visual treatments and landscaping	Regeneration of Riverstone Station should use plants that are native to the area.	Statement of Commitment no. 32 states *that the Proponent would use locally endemic native plants for revegetation*. Statement of Commitment no 37 also states that an *urban and landscape design plan would be prepared for the Project during detailed design in consultation with RailCorp*, *relevant agencies and councils which address the principals of urban design and landscaping as detailed in chapter 9.1 of the Environmental Assessment*. High quality urban design would be implemented at Riverstone Station to tie the new infrastructure visually to the existing infrastructure, and to reduce the potential visual impacts on the heritage values of the station. The urban and landscape design plan may include plantings within the Riverstone Station forecourt. Plant species used in landscaping would be native, low maintenance, drought tolerant and hardy species to maximise the longevity of landscaping.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					Plant species used for landscaping within RailCorp land would be consistent with RailCorp's (2006) *Revegetation Treatments for RailCorp Lands – Design Guidance and Specification* which includes the use of native species where possible.
7	23	Socio-economic	Compensation for businesses	What compensation is planned for existing shop owners to compensate for loss of business?	There is no compensation planned for existing shop owners. The impact of relocating Schofields Station on local businesses and the community was documented in Section 8.3.4 of the Environmental Assessment and in Section 3.2.1 of the report (*refer to Sub-issue 3 – socio-economic impacts*).
7	24	Project design	Station design, visual treatments and landscaping	The proposed plans for new upgraded stations are ugly.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 7 (ref. no. 21).
7	25	Public safety	Relocation of Schofields Station	What security is provided for commuters walking home to old Schofields at night?	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 15) and submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5) for discussion on public safety issues and measures to be included in the design of the shared user path (respectively).
8	26	Other	Quakers Hill Station	Would use the rail system if there was adequate parking at Quakers Hill.	Noted. Car parking at Quakers Hill Station is outside the scope of work for the Project, however as stated in TIDC's response to submission no. 6, ref no. 19, the NSW Minister for Transport David Campbell announced in January 2009 a new commuter car park will be built at Quakers Hill as part of the NSW Government's Commuter Car Park Program. It is anticipated the program will deliver an estimated 200 car spaces. Detailed investigation of potential sites is currently underway, with construction expected to begin in 2010. It is expected that the car park will be completed in 2011.
8	27	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	The Project should improve the available rail service. More people will use the trains.	Noted.
8	28	Other	Quakers Hill Station	Will there be an upgrade of parking at Quakers Hill? Currently the streets around Quakers Hill Station are parked out.	Refer to submission no. 8 (ref. no. 26).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
8	29	Other	Quakers Hill Station	Better bus services would also help in the Quakers Hill Station catchment.	This is outside the proposed scope of works for the Project. As part of its responsibilities, the MoT is tasked with improving performance across NSW bus networks including matching community needs with equitable and accessible transport. The MoT conducts yearly service reviews and works with partner agencies to implement key strategic initiatives aimed at improving bus service performance.
9	30	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Ideally, Schofields Station should remain at its current location. Moving the Station would be devastating to local business, residents and the community in general.	The relocation of Schofields Station discussed in Section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 of the report and is referenced in TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5), submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7 , 8 and 9) and submission no. 5 (ref. no. 15).
9	31	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	People have moved near the Station, for the reason to be close to the station and not have it moved.	Noted. The relocation of Schofields Station discussed in Section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 of the report and is referenced in TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 3, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).
9	32	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	Using Bridge Street as an access road to the Station is not practical as the street is too narrow and has two blind corners and would be a danger to local residents. It would also create extra parking problems along the whole street.	Refer to Section 3.2.3 of the report which details the construction (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) on Bridge Street.
10	33	Project design	Consideration of additional stations.	Agrees that a new station is warranted.	Noted.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
10	34	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The decommissioning of the existing Schofields Station is not necessary. This station could remain as an unmanned station and this would save on demolition costs.	Decommissioning Schofields Station is planned as part of the current proposal for Stage 1. As a recent option resulting from this submission and other similar submissions requesting the same considerations, TIDC has investigated the potential advantages and disadvantages from keeping the existing station open beyond the completion of Stage 1, in consultation with operators RailCorp. Section 3.2.2 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) of this report provides reasons for why retaining Schofields Station would not be possible considering operational costs, timetabling, footbridge construction and Stage 2 planning and design.
10	35	Project design	Station design, visual treatments and landscaping	The proposed design of the new Schofields and Riverstone stations are out of keeping with the rural setting of the surrounding area. Would like to see the design of the station being more in keeping with the current Riverstone Station.	Refer TIDC's response to submission no. 7 (ref. no. 21). Designs are indicative only and are subject to further detailed design and the development of the Urban Design Landscaping Plan (UDLP) which involves consultation with Blacktown City Council and the community.
10	36	Project design	Station design, visual treatments and landscaping	The proposed station designs are unattractive and would be an eyesore.	Refer TIDC's response to submission no. 7 (ref. no. 21).
11	37	Noise and vibration	Noise mitigation	Confirmation whether sound barriers will be installed behind the houses that back onto the railway line to mitigate the increase in noise that the extra trains will cause.	Section 4.2.7 of this report details the noise mitigation measures that will be investigated further for identified locations where operational rail noise levels are predicted to exceed the IGANRIP trigger levels. The three options for noise measures (in the hierarchy of measures) proposed for further consideration include at source (i.e. rail dampers), at-corridor (noise barriers) and then at-receiver measures (i.e. architectural treatment. The most appropriate mitigation measures would be selected during the detailed design phase of the Project.
12	38	Project design	Station design, visual treatments and landscaping	The design of the new stations is ugly.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 7 (ref. no. 21).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
12	39	Project design	Station design, visual treatments and landscaping	The design of the new stations at Schofields and Vineyard should match Riverstone Station.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 7 (ref. no. 21).
12	40	Non-Indigenous heritage	Riverstone Station	The existing Riverstone Station should be heritage listed and restored, particularly the old Station Master's house.	As described in Section 3.5.2, the Riverstone Railway Station and Yard Group is a registered heritage item on the State Heritage Register, RailCorp's S170 Register, Blacktown LEP and the Register of the National Trust. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 7 (ref. no. 20) regarding the proposed upgrade works at Riverstone Station. Further information on the heritage significance of Riverstone Station is provided in Section 3.5 of the Environmental Assessment. The impact of the Project on Riverstone Station is described in Section 8.5 of the Environmental Assessment and Section 3.2.5 of this report.
12	41	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Retain the existing Schofields Station, as it is not fair on existing older residents who wanted to live closer to the Station.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 3, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).
12	42	Project design	Consideration of additional stations.	Construct a new station named after the new estate (e.g. 'Pelican Road Station').	The relocated Schofields Station will retain the name "Schofields Station" as it remains within the Schofields suburb boundary.
13	43	Support for the Project	–	Supports the Project.	Noted.
13	44	Project design	Extension of proposed duplication of the Richmond Branch Line	Consideration should be given to extending the Duplication to Mulgrave, which is an additional distance of just 3 kilometres. Mulgrave already serves a growing demand from commuters in the expanding and surrounding areas East of the Hawkesbury River.	The Project proposes to duplicate the Richmond Branch Line from just north of Quakers Hill Station to just south of Bandon Road. A duplication of the Richmond line further north is outside the proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project. However, the project would not preclude the continuation of a duplicated line at a later date.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
13	45	Project design	Extension of proposed duplication of the Richmond Branch Line	It is presumed that the existing Mulgrave substation could serve the duplication of the tracks between Vineyard and Mulgrave, as a new sub-station has only been proposed at Schofields.	This Project does include the upgrade of the substation at Mulgrave but all works would be within the current building structure. The power system has been developed specifically to enable the expected increase in train numbers on the duplicated tracks between Quakers Hill and Vineyard. Future power requirements on the RailCorp network will be reviewed as required.
13	46	Other	Other rail projects	The Project would serve the NSW Government's earlier proposal to link into and join the railway line from Castle Hill, via Rouse Hill.	This is outside the proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project. This Project has been developed to serve the existing and future needs of the NWGC and is to duplicate the existing line only.
14	47	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Will the proposed bus service between new and old Schofields stations be free, and will it meet all train services?	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1) regarding the *Schofields Station Transition Plan* which addresses future bus services between the existing and new Schofields Station. Bus service frequencies are determined by MoT. The bus services are anticipated to be provided by private operators, and as such the bus service is not likely to be free. The cost of using the bus service would be determined by the MoT and would depend on the distance of travel, as per existing pricing arrangements for bus fares.
14	48	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Why not keep the existing Station as an unmanned station, even if every train service does not stop at the existing station. Doing so would remove the need for bus services which would cost more money and emit more greenhouse gas emissions).	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 10 (ref. no. 34). The Project would reduce greenhouse gases through the improvement of rail infrastructure as a means to increase rail capacity and encourage commuters to travel via public transport.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
14	49	Project design	Station design, visual treatments and landscaping	The proposed design of the new stations is ugly, unfriendly and unwelcoming.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 7 (ref. no. 21).
14	50	Project design	Station design, visual treatments and landscaping	The design of the new stations should match that of Riverstone station.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 7 (ref. no. 21).
15	51	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Relocating Schofields Station would benefit Quakers Hill residents who live closer to the new Schofields Station than Quakers Hill Station.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 3, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).
15	52	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Would rely on either bicycle parking at the new Schofields Station, or walking to the Station.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5) and submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9).
15	53	Project design	Pedestrian and cyclist provisions	Will the Project include bicycle stands at the new Schofields Station and/or a footpath linking Burdekin Road with Schofields Station? This would be a major benefit to commuters using Schofields Station as it would reduce traffic congestion and encourage alternative transport modes such as walking/cycling.	Section 3.2.1 (sub-issue 1) of the report discusses accessibility impacts and details that the new Schofields Station will have approximately 40 bike racks, 20 of which will be located on the eastern side and 20 located on the western side. Concrete padmounts will be provided by the Project allowing the installation of bike lockers as required. A footpath is not proposed to be provided between Burdekin Road and the new Schofields Station as part of this Project, however there will be a shared user path (see figure 4-3 in Section 4 of this report) between the existing Schofields Station and the new Schofields Station to be located on the eastern side of the rail corridor. TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5) provides further detail. The development of additional pedestrian and cycleway infrastructure alongside the rail corridor is included in the Strategies and Land Release Branch plans and would be provided during the development of the NWGC. Paths located within road reserves are planned to be constructed by

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					developers and dedicated to Council through conditions of development consent (GCC 2008c). It is anticipated that paths within land zoned for open space will be funded through Section 94 Contributions (GCC 2008c). Figure 4-4 provides the cycleway Strategies and Land Release Branch plans.
16	54	Public safety	Relocation of Schofields Station	Opposes the relocation of moving Schofields Station as the increased walking distance places people at a greater safety risk, particularly during the evenings.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 15) and submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5) for discussion on public safety issues and measures to be included in the design of the shared user path (respectively).
16	55	Environmental assessment	Inadequate assessment	Impact study is biased and does not adequately consider the impact the relocation of Schofields Station will have on the community of Schofields which is built around the shops and train station.	The positive and negative impacts of relocating Schofields Station on local businesses, residents and the wider community were documented in Section 8.3.4 of the Environmental Assessment and discussed in Section 3.2.1(*refer to sub-issue 3 socio-economic impacts*) of this report. TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 14) which discussed accessibility and provides detail on the car parking and other facilities provided at the new Schofields Station, as per Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 1*) of this report.
16	56	Planning and statutory context	Planning process	The State Government can change the rules without considering the community.	Section 3.2.2 (refer to sub-issue 2) provides a response to the justification of the preferred Project option, with reference to the due planning approval process as followed under the NSW EP&A Act.
16	57	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Does not oppose the construction of a new station, providing that the existing Schofields Station is not relocated.	Noted. As discussed in Section 3.2.2 of the report, the proposed new Schofields Station will meet the needs of the existing Schofields residents as well as provide for the future planned growth of the area. The preferred option to relocate Schofields Station provides holistic benefits for land use planning and rail operations.
16	58	Consultation	Project design	Was not aware the new Schofields Station was to be built at another location towards Quakers Hill.	Project notifications and updates distributed in February 2008, May 2008 and April 2009 and advertisements in local newspapers have referred to the proposed relocation of Schofields Station. The Strategies and Land Release branch Precinct Planning Report for Riverstone and Alex Avenue precincts have also referenced the relocated Schofields Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
16	59	Socio-economic	Community cohesion	Relocating Schofields Station will split up Schofields into two communities, these being Old and New Schofields.	Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 12 (ref. no. 42) regarding retaining Schofields as the name of the relocated Schofields Station. The Strategies and Land Branch is currently preparing plans for the revitalisation of the Schofields village centre as part of the development of the North West Growth Centre. Plans for the village is likely to focus on the following outcomes: ▪ encouraging further commercial development within the village centre to complement and support the existing small businesses ▪ encouraging the revitalisation of Schofields as a village centre to differentiate it from the new town centre planned within the Alex Avenue Precinct (adjacent to the new station location) ▪ retaining the existing community feel within Schofields village by promoting development that is consistent with a village community. It is expected that the implementation of the Strategies and Land Release Branch's revitalisation plan will reinforce the Schofield village centre's role as a neighbourhood centre within the Riverstone precinct. As such, the relocation of Schofields Station is not expected to impact on the cohesion of the Schofields community. In addition, the provision of the pedestrian footbridge at Schofields is expected to maintain the east-west community linkage by providing easy access across the railway corridor.
16	60	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Elderly residents that lived close to the existing Station for over 60 years will not be able to travel 800 metres further to access the new Station.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
16	61	Public safety	Relocation of Schofields Station	Relocating Schofields Station will result in an increased safety risk to pensioners and women who live near the existing station. These people will become more vulnerable to robbery, assaults and attacks.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5), submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9) and submission no. 5 (ref. no. 15).
16	62	Socio-economic	Business viability	Impact on the local Schofields shops that rely on the Station for business.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8), for a response on business impacts expected at Schofields village should Schofields Station be relocated.
17	63	Other	Other	Request to be considered as a sub-contractor during the construction of the Project.	Noted.
18	64	Other	Other	Request to be considered to provide the services of Access Consultancy	Noted.
19	65	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	The Project has no advantage to residents in Quakers Hill.	Noted. As part of this duplication project, the relocation of Schofields Station will benefit some residents in Quakers Hill who may be closer in distance to the new station than Quakers Hill Station. These residents may wish to use the new station and benefit from the additional parking and new amenities this relocated station will provide. Section 3.2.4 of the report provides details on separate projects which will benefit Quakers Hill Station.
19	66	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	There is insufficient station capacity at Quakers Hill. There are at least 200 passengers each catching the trains at 7.16 am and 7.46 am from Quakers Hill. Both of these train services stop at all stations between	The Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication Project's purpose is primarily focused on duplicating the rail line from 150m north of Quakers Hill through to Vineyard. Quakers Hill Station therefore has a duplicated track currently. Section 3.2.2 and 8.2.2 of the EA provides an assessment of the current and future rail services and shows Quakers Hill Station currently has two extra services per hour in the AM peak (6-9am) compared to Schofields, Riverstone and Vineyard. The upgrade of the rail corridor would facilitate high train frequencies with the completion of Stage 1 allowing up to six peak train services per hour through

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
				Quakers Hill and Parramatta, which results in at least 600-700 passengers alighting from this stations in one hour in the mornings, with equivalent numbers in the evenings.	Schofields and Quakers Hill. Four of these services would start and terminate at Schofields and two at Richmond. Stage 1 is due for completion in 2011. The completion of Stage 2 would allow up to eight peak train services per hour, with six services starting/terminating at Vineyard and two at Richmond. Stage 2 is currently deferred to be in line with the development of the North West Growth Centre.
19	67	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	There have been talks for years that Quakers Hill station would be upgraded. What happened to these proposals?	As stated in TIDC's response to submission no. 16 (ref. no. 65), Section 3.2.4 of the report details the separate proposals for additional car parking and easy access upgrade at Quakers Hill Station, as announced by the NSW Government.
19	68	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	Long queues for tickets at Quakers Hill Station, as there is only one ticketing machine and one counter, which means that many commuters miss trains.	This project does not include works to Quakers Hill Station. Please refer to Section 3.2.4 of the report for further details on separate NSW Government projects involving Quakers Hill Station.
19	69	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	There are insufficient facilities at Quakers Hill Station for less mobile passengers (such as the disabled) or with passengers with prams.	This project does not include works to Quakers Hill Station. Please refer to Section 3.2.4 (*sub-issue 2*) of the report for further details on separate NSW Government projects involving Quakers Hill Station.
19	70	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	Quakers Hill station only has one flight of stairs and does not have a lift. There are also insufficient kiss-and-ride facilities at this station.	This project does not include works to Quakers Hill Station. Please refer to Section 3.2.4 (sub-issue 2) of the report for further details on separate NSW Government projects involving Quakers Hill Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
19	71	Traffic and transport	Patronage demand	Will the proposed relocation of Schofields Station relieve commuter congestion at Quakers Hill?	The Project commences north of Quakers Hill Station, however as discussed in TIDC's response to submission no. 19 (ref. no. 66), the Project would facilitate higher train frequencies. The completion of Stage 1 would allow up to six peak train services per hour through Schofields and Quakers Hill. The completion of Stage 2 would allow up to eight peak train services per hour, with six services starting/terminating at Vineyard and two at Richmond. Stage 2 is currently deferred to be in line with the development of the NWGC. The duplication is proposed to address planned future development in the area.
19	72	Traffic and transport	Patronage demand	Commuters catching trains from Quakers Hill have difficulty getting a seat on the train. Has a study been conducted to alleviate the issue of overcrowding on the Richmond Line?	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 19 (ref. no. 66 and 71) which state the Project would facilitate higher train frequencies. The completion of Stage 1 would allow up to six peak train services per hour through Schofields and Quakers Hill.
19	73	Traffic and transport	Patronage demand	Will the proposed relocation of Schofields Station result in more people catching the train from Schofields, rather than Quakers Hill? If so, this will result in Quakers Hill residents missing out on getting a seat on the train as the trains would already be full before they arrive at Quakers Hill Station.	As discussed in TIDC's response to Submission no. 19, ref no. 66 and 71, the upgrade of the rail corridor would facilitate higher train frequencies. The completion of Stage 1 would allow up to six peak train services per hour through Schofields and Quakers Hill.
19	74	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	There are only 4 stations between Quakers Hill and Vineyard; however Quakers Hill is the only station that will not be upgraded. Why are Quakers Hill residents being discriminated against?	This project does not include works to Quakers Hill Station. Please refer to Section 3.2.4 of the report for further details on separate NSW Government projects involving Quakers Hill Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
19	75	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	The footbridge proposed to replace the existing pedestrian level crossing is to facilitate the new line. It is for the benefit of the new project, not so much to provide safer access across the rail corridor for Quakers Hill residents. In addition will City Rail customers be able to use the new footbridge to get to the trains?	Section 3.2.4 of the report for further details on separate NSW Government projects involving Quakers Hill Station. RailCorp's Easy Access Upgrade Program (refer to sub-issue 1 in Section 3.2.4), Quakers Hill Station will benefit from works planned to improve accessibility. The Quakers Hill footbridge will be included in RailCorp's Easy Access Upgrade Program, rather than as part of the Projects scope. Further detail on this recent modification to the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project is detailed in section 5 of this report.
19	76	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	The Project will not improve accessibility at Quakers Hill station as no lifts or ramps will be provided at this station.	Section 3.2.4 (*refer to sub-issue 1*) of the report for further details on separate NSW Government projects involving Quakers Hill Station.
19	77	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	How will the Project reduce bottlenecks at Quakers Hill station?	As discussed in TIDC's response to submission no. 19 (ref. no. 66 and 71), the upgrade of the rail corridor would facilitate higher train frequencies at Quakers Hill Station.
19	78	Project design	No upgrade to Quakers Hill Station	The Project will not reduce congestion at Quakers Hill Station.	As discussed in TIDC's response to Submission no. 19, ref no. 66 and 71, the upgrade of the rail corridor would facilitate higher train frequencies at Quakers Hill Station.
20	79	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Objects to the planned relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
20	80	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	The original plan was for the existing Schofields Station to be upgraded, and a new station, known as Nirimba, to be built closer to Quakers Hill Station. This option would have been ideal as the new Nirimba Station would provide the benefits of the relocated Schofields Station, while also retaining the existing Schofields Station.	Chapter 5 of the EA provides the justification for the preferred option of relocating Station (Option C) when investigating the three proposed options of Option A (new Nirimba Station), Option B (Upgrade Schofields Station and provide new station 800m south of existing station) and Option C (Relocate Schofields Station 800m south of existing station). As part of Strategies and Land Release Branch investigations for the Alex Avenue and Riverstone precincts, a whole-of-government view was formed that the relocation of Schofields Station, in preference to the redevelopment of the existing station and construction of a new station at Nirimba, would better support the planned development of the area. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides an overview of the justification of the relocation of Schofields Station, including development of the Preferred Project Option (*refer to sub-issue 1 in Section 3.2.2*).
20	81	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	The provision of an additional station, in conjunction with the retention of the existing Schofields Station, would provide more opportunity for people to walk to/from the station, and reduce the distance travelled in buses and cars, thus reducing fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions.	Section 3.2.2 of the report provides an overview of the justification of the relocation of Schofields Station. Section 3.2.1(*refer to sub-issue 1*) of the report discusses accessibility impacts resulting from the relocation of Schofields Station and the design components such as the shared user path and bike racks that have be integrated into the concept design plans. Further to this, TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5) and no. 23 (ref. no. 112) also provides detail on the shared used path, provision of bus routes and car parking facilities. TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 82) notes that as part of the Strategies and Land Release Branch Precinct Plans for Alex Avenue and Riverstone, a greater proportion of people will reside within walking distance of the station.
20	82	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	An additional station would allow for more medium and high density dwellings to be situated close to a station.	One of the justifications of relocating Schofields Station approximately 800m south of its current location acknowledges this option would better support the planned development of the area in reference to the proposed Strategies and Land Release Branch Alex Avenue and Riverstone precincts. Rail station relocations of Vineyard and Schofields stations will improve access, parking facilities and connections to buses. The Precincts are being planned so that areas of higher density housing will be concentrated along public transport

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					corridors and most homes will be within 400 metres of public transport. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 17).
20	83	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	Disagrees with the justification provided in the Environmental Assessment that one of the reasons for relocating Schofields Station was due to the surrounding land being flood affected, and thus high density buildings could not be built in the vicinity of the existing Schofields Station. Has not ever seen Schofields Station or its immediate surrounds flooded.	Section 3.7 of the Environmental Assessment (EA) details the existing flood risk as it is acknowledged parts of the Blacktown LGA are susceptible to flooding, including parts of the Project study area. The EA has relied on flood risk information sourced from Blacktown City Council and has used this data to replicate the mapping of flood-prone areas as low, medium or high risk. These categories are based on flood level, velocity and/or frequency of expected flood waters and are indicated in Figure 3-21 of the EA. The Blacktown City Council data, together with the culvert flood study completed by Maunsell (2007) determined that Eastern Creek has a backwater influence on upstream flood levels from Schofields to Victoria Street, Riverstone. The data from these two technical sources indicated that the study area is prone to low-, medium- and high-risk flooding with areas of high flood risk along the eastern side of the rail corridor including residential areas just north and south of Schofields Station. There are existing residences and developed land coinciding within these high flood-risk areas currently. One of the reasons for moving Schofields Station as considered in Chapter 5 of the EA states: ▪ The fragmented ownership and flooding impacts around the existing Schofields Station would limit the ability to provide higher densities closer to the station and thus limit the efficiency of transit-oriented development. The EA also states in comparison: ▪ The area around the proposed new Schofields Station is not affected by the 1 in 100-year flood level allowing for higher density of transit-oriented development to occur around the proposed station on a greenfield site. The EA therefore does not state that "high density buildings couldn't be built", rather that the current high risk flood prone areas that exist in parts north and south of the existing Schofields Station together with the surrounding fragmented ownership of land would limit the ability to provide higher densities.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
20	84	Water quality and hydrology	Flooding	There is ample land close to the station suitable for medium/high density housing, unless the PMF is used as the criteria for defining flood prone land. If this is the case, any land which is likely to be flooded by a 1 in 100,000 year event is to be sterilised.	As discussed in TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 83) the flood risk data was sourced from Blacktown City Council. It is the Council, via the Local Environmental Plan (LEP), and in consultation with the Strategies and Land Release Branch, which would determine suitable zoning for medium/high density housing. The probable maximum flood (PMF) represents the probable maximum flood and represents the worse-case flood event. The PMF event for the upper reaches of the Eastern Creek catchment was assessed by the Strategies and Land Release Branch as part of the detailed technical studies undertaken for the Alex Avenue and Riverstone precincts, located between Quakers Hill and Vineyard (GHD 2008). Therefore, the EA has referred to the same technical studies as documented by the Strategies and Land Release Branch. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 83).
20	85	Water quality and hydrology	Flooding	If cut-and-fill is a good solution for the Riverstone West Business Park development, then why not apply it to Schofields, and retain the existing station.	The justification for relocating the station is discussed in Section 3.2.2 of the report and referenced in TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7), submission no. 5 (ref. no. 13) and submission no. 20 (ref. no. 83). As stated in these responses, the movement of Schofields Station has been proposed for a number of reasons including current land use and environmental constraints, availability of land, constructability factors, fragmentation of land ownership at the current station location and anticipated NWGC development which has been detailed through the Strategies and Land Release Branch. For such a solution to be achieved, a significant impact on residential landholdings would result and require relocation of these residents.
20	86	Environmental assessment	Inadequate assessment	The Environmental Impact Statement makes little mention of the social and economic impacts on existing residents and businesses in Schofields.	Section 3.2.1 provides reference to the social and economic impacts (*refer to sub-issue 3*) resulting from the Project. Social and economic impacts were assessed in section 8.3.4 of the Environmental Assessment.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
20	87	Socio-economic	Business viability	A cursory attempt was made to count commuters/ shoppers, and there was little appreciation of the detrimental economic impacts that the relocation of the station will have on the existing businesses located next to the station.	Section 3.2.1 provides reference to the social and economic impacts (*refer to sub-issue 3*) resulting from the Project to local businesses, residents and the wider community. Social and economic impacts specific to the relocation of Schofields Station were assessed in section 8.3.4 of the Environmental Assessment.
20	88	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	The Environmental assessment made no admission that the community, particularly the elderly, would be severely impacted by the relocation of Schofields Station.	Section 8.3.4 of the EA specifically focuses on relocating Schofields Station and the impact this would have on Schofield's village. This section of the EA states "The impact would be greatest for those who commute on a regular basis and those with limited mobility (e.g. the elderly, disabled and parents with young children), with an additional concern that access may be less safe during evening periods and throughout winter given decreased or no natural lighting." The EA therefore notes that different residents/community members will be impacted differently depending on individual circumstance and location of residence. Section 3.2.1 provides reference to the accessibility and social and economic impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1 and 3*) resulting from the Project to local businesses, residents and the wider community.
20	89	Public safety	Relocation of Schofields Station	Walking to/from the new Schofields Station will be hazardous, especially in the dark, until Railway Terrace is upgraded, lighting is improved, and housing occurs along both sides of the railway line.	Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5) and submission no. 5 (ref. no. 15) which provide details on a shared user path. The shared user path will be constructed during Stage 1 of the Project and will incorporate design principles regarding public safety, crime prevention and lighting considerations.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
20	90	Socio-economic	Property values	The Environmental Assessment provides no comment about the economic impact on house prices in the area. Homes which were close to the station, under this proposal, will be a further 800 metres away.	There may be some impacts on property prices in Schofields due to changes to distance and travel times for local residents. However the project would result in increased frequency of trains and improved access to public transport facilities providing commuters with more choice regarding time of and mode of travel. It is difficult to assess the impacts of the Project on the value of properties around Schofields Station due to a number of external factors, such as fluctuations in the Sydney property market and the development of the NWGC.
20	91	Socio-economic	Management of impacts	The Environmental Assessment provided 'lip service' to what, if anything, will be done to offset the socio-economic impacts at Schofields. Concern promises may not be kept.	Section 8.3 of the EA provides discussion on management measures which aim to address social and economic impacts where possible. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) of the report indicates there will be both positive and negative social and economic impacts from the relocation of Schofields Station. TIDC's response to submission no. 16 (ref. no. 59) discusses the proposed revitalisation of Schofields village is part of the Strategies and Land Release Branch plans. It is also noted that further consultation with the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RailCorp would be undertaken to determine the future plans for the Schofields village centre and the plans for rehabilitation of the existing station site. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 1*), provides more information on the Schofields Schofields Station Transition Plan and bus service considerations as part of this plan. The final SoCs for the Project are provided in Chapter 6 (refer Table 6-1) which describes the measures that TIDC will commit to during the pre-construction, construction and operational phases of the Project to manage the impacts identified in the Environmental Assessment and subsequent issues identified during the preparation of the Submissions Report. The final SoCs will be considered by the Department of Planning in assessing the Project. Should approval be granted by the Minister for Planning, approval conditions would take into consideration the final SoCs proposed for the Project and would be legally binding on the project, and included in the conditions of approval.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
20	92	Consultation	Project design	Confirmation as to which stakeholders were invited to take part in deciding whether to relocate the station. Were any locals asked for their input? More importantly, was any notice taken of their views?	Section 3.2.2 (*refer to sub-issue 1 and 2*) provide detail on the development and justification of the preferred project option. Chapter 2 of this report details the consultation that has occurred on the project since the project's inception. Various meetings were held with governmental agencies and the community in mid and late 2008. These sessions were viewed as an opportunity to gain an appreciation of community concerns and to provide further information to the community. The views and issues raised by community members during these sessions have been recorded and considered. For example, access from the western side of the rail corridor to the new Schofields Station was incorporated into the current concept design as a result residents on the western side of the corridor raising this accessibility issue at the community information sessions in May 2008. Moreover, TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 16) demonstrates that all comments made on the Project, and particularly through the public exhibition and recent community information sessions, are being addressed in this submission report. This report will aid the Minister for Planning to consider all submissions prior to making a determination on the Project.
21	93	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	Had not been informed about the public exhibition of the Environmental Assessment, due to not being included in the letterbox drop.	As outlined in Chapter 2, TIDC undertook a number of consultation activities during the exhibition of the Environmental Assessment, which included placing advertisements in six local newspapers, placing information on the Project website, letter-box dropping project update newsletters to approximately 14,000 residences, including the postage of newsletter direct to stakeholders on the Project database. TIDC have sought, as far as practical, to advise all stakeholders and others with an interest in the Project and exhibited EA to ensure they have had an opportunity to comment on the Project. Further details of the consultation activities that TIDC undertook during the exhibition of the Environmental Assessment are described in Chapter 2 and in response no. 21 in Table D (Government Agency Table) in Appendix D. Further consultation on the Project will occur up to, during and after the construction phase.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
21	94	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	Requests that TIDC undertake a letterbox drop to residents in Shanes Park, Llandilo, Berkshire Park, Marsden Park.	Noted. The areas that the Project Update newsletter was distributed to was based on the communities that were likely to be directly affected by the Project (both adverse and beneficial impacts). Further details of the notification and consultation activities that TIDC undertook during the exhibition of the Environmental Assessment are described in Chapter 2 and in response no. 21 in Table D (Government Agency Table) in Appendix D.
21	95	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	Residents that have not been included in the letterbox drop are unaware of the proposal.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 21 (ref. no. 93).
21	96	Consultation	Project design	Supports the project.	Noted.
21	97	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	Requests that TIDC extend the time of the submission period.	The Department of Planning is responsible for determining whether an extension in the time period of the exhibition of the EA is warranted. The EA was exhibited from 29 April to 1 June, which satisfies the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* requirements to exhibit for a minimum of 30 days. The Department of Planning did not extend the exhibition period past 1 June 2009, however late submissions up to the end of June were received and considered as part of this report.
21	98	Other	Western road access to Vineyard Station.	With the upgrade of Vineyard Railway Station, access should also be provided from Richmond Road near Windsor Downs and Berkshire Park so residents from Shanes Park, Llandilo, Berkshire Park, Windsor Downs and the future residents in Marsden Park can get access to the local Vineyard Railway Station and promote public transport. There is currently no access for residents who	This is outside the proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project. The provision of additional road infrastructure to the NWGC will be coordinated by the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA in consultation with other agencies.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
				live west of Vineyard Railway Station. Bandon Road stops short of Richmond Road and could be extended to provide this access.	
21	99	Project design	Vineyard Station	Requests that a commuter car park is constructed on the western side of Vineyard Station as part of the proposed works.	Noted. As described in Section 6.2.1 of the Environmental Assessment, the Project proposes to locate the commuter car park at Vineyard Station on the eastern side of the rail corridor. This car park is proposed to be constructed in two phases to meet commuter demand over time. The first phase (phase 1) would be constructed along Riverstone Parade. The second phase (phase 2) is proposed to be constructed as an extension to the phase 1 car park on its northern side along Ashford Road. However, the exact location of the phase 2 car park would be determined following more detailed site investigations and consideration of alternative locations (such as on the western side of the station). These investigations would be undertaken in conjunction with the Strategies and Land Release Branch and Department of Environment and Climate Change (DECC). Construction of the phase 2 car park on the western side of Vineyard Station would be developed in consultation with the Strategies and Land Release Branch. The Riverstone West precinct layout plan has been developed around the provision of the commuter car park on the eastern side of the rail corridor and outside the Riverstone West precinct (GCC 2009). To avoid conflicts with the Strategies and Land Release Branch plans on the eastern side car park, TIDC would continue to consult with the Strategies and Land Release Branch to ensure that its plans for the Riverstone Precinct are not precluded by the construction of the Phase 2 car park. Further discussion on the location of the Phase 2 car park is provided in TIDC's response to ref. no. 156 in Table D (refer Appendix D), and submission no. 59 and 66 of this table.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
21	100	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Providing access to Vineyard Station is important for commuting and access to the proposed Riverstone West Business Park with approximately 12,000 jobs recently on display.	Noted. Access to Vineyard Station would be maximised through the delivery of the commuter car park, bus interchange, kiss-and-ride, and taxi facilities at Vineyard Station. Access to Vineyard Station would also be supported by the Strategies and Land Release Branch's plans to create a distinct town centre adjacent to the relocated Vineyard Station as part of the Riverstone Precinct (GCC 2008).
22	101	Other	Other rail projects	The NSW State Government should preserve a corridor from Vineyard to Rouse Hill as well as Castle Hill and Epping for the future. Vineyard would be the junction of the train from Blacktown. This corridor should be utilised for heavy rail.	This is outside the proposed scope of the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project.
22	102	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The existing Schofields Station should remain where it is. Instead, a new station should be built halfway between Schofields and Quakers Hill. This new Station should be called Nirimba Station.	Refer to Section 3.2.2 for the justification of why Schofields Station is proposed to be relocated and submission no. 28 (ref. no. 124).
22	103	Project design	Extension of proposed duplication of the Richmond Branch Line	The State Government should duplicate the Richmond Branch Line to Mulgrave Station and construct a new station between Vineyard and Mulgrave stations.	This is outside the proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 13 (ref. no. 44).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
23	104	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Why close Schofields Station?	Section 3.2.2 of the report (refer to sub-issue 2) provides justification for the relocation of Schofields Station, thus decommissioning the existing station. Sub-issue 3 this section discusses the reasons for why Schofields Station is to be decommissioned prior to the commencement of Stage 2. Further reference to the decommissioning of existing Schofields Station as part of Stage 1 of the Project is provided in TIDC's response to submission no. 10 (ref. no. 34).
23	105	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	What happened with the 2005-2008 plans for 2 stations (existing Schofields and Nirimba Stations) to make 2 smaller townships? This was a much fairer plan for all residents of Schofields and the new Alex Avenue.	Section 3.2.2 of the report details the justification for relocating Schofields Station as the preferred project option. This section also details the development of the preferred project option (*refer to sub-issue 1*) which looks at some of the planning documents and plans as released by the NSW Government and the Strategies and Land Release Branch since 2005 and the refinement of proposed plans and strategies. For further discussion on the proposed decommissioning of existing Schofields Station refer TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 104), no. 10 (ref. no. 34) and no. 28 (ref. no. 124).
23	106	Socio-economic	Accessibility	Where is the care, concern and respect for the current residents who live in Schofields to be near the station?	The Project aims to balance the needs of the existing Schofields residents and the future needs of the Alex Avenue precinct. As detailed in Section 8.3.4 of the Environmental Assessment, and reiterated in Section 3.2.1 of this report, the relocation of Schofields Station would have an impact on existing residents who currently access Schofields Station by walking and cycling. Section 3.2.1 provides a response regarding the key issues (as determined from submissions received) concerning the relocation of Schofields Station, including accessibility, public safety and the socio-economic impacts to local businesses, residents and wider community. Discussion on the proposed decommissioning of existing Schofields Station is provided in Section 3.2.2 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) of the report. TIDC's response to various submissions in this reports such as submission no. 23 (ref. no. 104), no. 10 (ref. no. 34), no. 4 (ref. no. 7) and no. 28 (ref. no. 124) also reference the impacts with relocating Schofields Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
23	107	Socio-economic	Property values	Closing Schofields Station will devalue property values around the station.	Section 3.2.1 (refer to sub-issue 3) discusses the impact on property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 90).
23	108	Public safety	Relocation of Schofields Station	Schofields residents will need to walk 900 metres longer to access the station, particularly night workers, TAFE students, and Uni students.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5); submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9); and submission no. 5 (ref. no. 15).
23	109	Socio-economic	Equality	There is rumour that Schofields Station is being relocated to benefit Blacktown City Council, Woolworths and the Greg Norman residential investment, yet the long-term residents of Schofields (who had an increase in land rates) are to be left without their station and township.	Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justification used in the Environmental Assessment to support the proposal to relocate Schofields Station. Section 3.2.1 of the report provides a response regarding the key issues (as determined from submissions received) concerning the relocation of Schofields Station, including accessibility, public safety and the socio-economic impacts to local businesses, residents and wider community.
23	110	Socio-economic	Community cohesion	Schofields residents will be left in 'no-mans land' halfway between Quakers Hill and Riverstone.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 16 (ref. no. 59).
23	111	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	The proposal will increase traffic on Grange Avenue and Bridge Street.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 9 (ref. no. 32) and no. 3 (ref. no. 6).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
23	112	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Closing Schofields Station conflicts with the NSW Government's objective to take cars off the road.	The Project would create an opportunity for public transport to be more accessible to the community by providing more frequent rail services and allowing for the greater integration of other modes of public transport, through the creation of bus interchange facilities at the new Schofields and Vineyard stations. The provision of an attractive, integrated and accessible public transport link for existing and future residents in this area would help to reduce the already high reliance on private cars as the main mode of transport for journeys to and from the area and would thus assist in achieving Priority S6 of the State Plan (i.e. to increase the share of peak hour journeys on public transport). The closure of existing Schofields Station is not expected to significantly increase the mode share of private vehicle use in the long-term. The Alex Avenue precinct has been planned to concentrate high density development in the vicinity of the new Schofields Station in the form of a distinct town centre. The relocation of the station close to this town centre will maximise the opportunity for residents to be located within walking distance of the station. For further discussion on the proposed decommissioning of existing Schofields Station refer to Section 3.2.2 (*sub issue 3*) and TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 104), no. 10 (ref. no. 34), no. 4 (ref. no. 7) and no. 28 (ref. no. 124).
23	113	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	Justification for relocating Schofields Station due to insufficient ability to integrate car parking spaces, bus terminals etc into the existing station. Engineers who planned the Merrylands station have built underground parking areas with a bus terminal above it. There is ample room at Schofields Station to do the same or find area behind the shopping area for an aboveground parking area.	There were many factors which led to the decision to relocate Schofields Station. These factors have been outlined in Section 3.2.2 (sub-issue 2) of the report. Based on the expected increase in demand for commuter car parking and bus interchange facilities, it is not feasible to upgrade the existing Schofields Station due to many factors, including the: ▪ provision of commuter car parking and bus interchange facility at existing Schofields Station would significantly alter the Schofields Village Centre, and would preclude the Strategies and Land Release Branch's plans to revitalise the existing village centre (refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 16, ref. no. 59). ▪ Costs, construction timeframe and rail possessions required to upgrade Schofields Station in its current location and configuration.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
24	114	Support for the Project	–	Very pleased with the outcome of the new railway system and commuter car parks.	Noted.
24	115	Support for the Project	–	Hopes the Project gets off the ground, the sooner the better.	Noted.
25	116	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	All construction traffic should access the RLA compound via Vernon Street, and not use Bridge Street. The main construction traffic route should be via Vernon Street, Argowan Road and Grange Avenue as this would provide the quickest route.	Noted. Section 4.2.1 of the report provides clarifications on construction traffic routes and access to construction compounds.
26	117	Noise and vibration	Noise mitigation	Noise barriers similar to those used on the RTA transit way should be used for this Project.	Further detail regarding reasonable and feasible noise mitigation measures such as discussed in TIDC's response to submission no. 11 (ref. no. 37) and Section 4.2.7 of this report.
27	118	Socio-economic	Accessibility	Moved to Schofields to be within walking distance of the station.	Noted.
27	119	Socio-economic	Equality	Original residents of Schofields are being ignored to make way for the new residents who are more likely to be able to walk to Old Schofields Station than the existing elderly residents.	Refer TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 106), no. 10 (ref. no. 34), no. 4 (ref. no. 7) and no. 28 (ref. no. 124).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
27	120	Socio-economic	Business viability	Local businesses at Schofields will be put out of business if Schofields Station is relocated.	Refer to TIDC response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8), for a response on business impacts expected at Schofields Village should Schofields Station be relocated.
28	121	Socio-economic	Accessibility	Moved to Schofields to be within walking distance of the station.	Noted.
28	122	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Will be unable to walk to the new Station.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9).
28	123	Socio-economic	Equality	Why are the Schofields residents being ignored in favour of the young at Richmond, who have two Stations close together?	Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the socio-economic concerns raised in submissions, with particular reference to local businesses, local residents and the wider community. The justification for the Project has been provided in Section 3.2.2.
28	124	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Why can't there be two stations at Schofields?	The justification for the Project has been provided in Section 3.2.2 (*refer sub-issue 2*). This justification provides the reasons for supporting the proposed relocation of Schofields Station. Reference to sub-issue 3 in Section 3.2.2 provides the reasoning behind decommissioning Schofields Station.
29	125	Other	Western road access to Vineyard Station	Access to Vineyard Station should be provided from Richmond Road for people living in Berkshire Park, Windsor Downs, Shanes Park, Llandilo and Marsden Park. Access could be provided by extending Bandon Road to Richmond Road. Residents of these areas currently have no access to Vineyard Station, despite it being the closer station.	This is outside the proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project. The provision of additional road infrastructure will be coordinated by the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
29	126	Project design	Riverstone Station	A commuter car park should be provided on the western side of Riverstone Railway Station to provide parking for residents from Marsden Park. This car park should be at least 220 spaces to match the car park on the eastern side of the station.	Section 3.2.5 (refer to sub-issue 2) provides a response regarding the Project scope of works for Riverstone Station and discusses additional parking considerations.
30	127	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Bridge Street is a quiet suburban street that was not designed to carry heavy machinery and four trucks per hour.	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction (*refer sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer sub-issue 2*) associated with the Project's proposed changes to Bridge Street.
30	128	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	How do residents on Bridge Street access their homes during construction?	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (refer sub-issue 1) to Bridge Street residents and provides management measures to be implemented during construction works, incorporating maintaining access during construction.
30	129	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Vernon Road and the bottom end of Argowan Road have five farms, while Bridge Street, Lane Place and Tain Place have 200 residential homes.	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (refer sub-issue 1), such as construction routes affecting Bridge Street. Table 3-3 provides the construction traffic strategy, with Figure 4-1 and 4-2 providing the construction access routes and compound locations proposed to be used during construction.
30	130	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	People park near the station and it will be a mess during construction.	As described in Section 8.2.1 of the Environmental Assessment, the existing Schofields Station would remain operational until completion of the new Schofields Station to ensure that the construction of the new Schofields Station would not disrupt commuters. The commuter car parking at the existing Schofields Station would be impacted during the construction of the pedestrian footbridge. It is anticipated the proposed footbridge would require the loss of around 25 parking spaces. The loss of commuter car parking prior to the commissioning of the new station would be offset to at least a one to one ratio to overcome impacts to commuter car parking availability at this location.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					Construction of the footbridge would have minimal impact on access to, and use of, the station platform.
31	131	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Prefers Schofields Station to remain at its current location; however acknowledges that the government does not want to upgrade the current station in addition to building the new station.	Noted. Refer to Section 3.2.2 which provides the justification for relocating Schofields Station as proposed by the Project.
31	132	Project design	Road works	Concerned about the proposal to create access to the new Schofields Station via Bridge Street.	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction (*refer sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer sub-issue 2*) associated with the Project's proposed changes to Bridge Street.
31	133	Project design	Road works	Vernon Road should be extended past the end of Bridge Street towards the new Schofields Station to provide vehicular access to the Station, instead of Bridge Street.	It is expected that the impact to Bridge Street (parking and accessibility to properties) and commuters would be increased if vehicle access was not provided to the station via Bridge Street during operation. Using Vernon Road as the vehicle access road to the station would require that pedestrian only access is provided via Bridge Street, otherwise the walking distance would be significantly increased for pedestrians accessing the western side of the station. If these provisions where put in place, then it would be expected that some commuters would park at the end of Bridge Street, and then walk between Bridge Street and the Station. This would result in Bridge Street being parked out during business days, which would reduce the local amenity and accessibility of surrounding residential properties. The construction impacts are reduced through using Vernon Road as an alternative construction traffic route, to be predominately used for heavy vehicles and machinery to access the construction compound and station site. The operational impacts of using Bridge Street rather than Vernon Road will increase traffic along Bridge Street for commuters accessing the Station and parking facilities via private car. Section 3.2.3 of the report further details the construction impacts (refer sub-issue 1), and operation impacts (refer to sub-issue 2) affecting residents along Bridge Street.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
31	134	Project design	Road works	Does not want Bridge Street widened.	Noted. Bridge Street is not proposed to be widened as part of this Project.
31	135	Noise and vibration	Operational noise impacts	Concerned that the Project will result in higher train volumes on the rail line. Also concerned that freight trains could end up using the tracks. Both of these scenarios will result in an increase in noise, additional to traffic noise.	As described in Section 6.4.1 of the Environmental Assessment, the Project would allow for an increase in passenger train services. It is anticipated that when Stage 1 (to the new Schofields Station) is operational, the Richmond Branch Line will have capacity to support up to six trains per hour through Quakers Hill, comprising four trains per hour starting from new Schofields Station, and two trains starting from Richmond. Once Stage 2 is fully operational, the Richmond Branch Line will have capacity to support up to eight trains per hour, comprising six trains starting from the new Vineyard Station and two trains starting from Richmond. The noise and vibration assessment that was undertaken for the Project predicted that operational noise levels would exceed the noise trigger levels at the Quakers Hill Preschool (located on the corner of Pearce and Lalor Roads), and a number of residential receivers located on Manorhouse Boulevard, Bridge Street and Tain Place. Further details of the noise impacts of the Project are provided in Section 8.4 of the Environmental Assessment. The Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project does not include the use of freight trains on the Richmond Branch Line. There is a proposal by a private landowner for a freight terminal near Riverstone Station, however, this proposal would need to be the subject to a separate Environmental Assessment and approval process and is not part of the Project.
31	136	Project design	Road works	Consider upgrading the Westminster Street Bridge joining Westminster Street and Bridge Street in Stage 1 of the Project. The current bridge is too narrow and has a sharp turn onto Bridge Street. If Stage 2 is never delivered, then there will be huge congestion on the current bridge and is not a desirable outcome.	The Project includes the proposed reconstruction of Westminster Street Bridge. Westminster Street Bridge is not required to be reconstructed or upgraded during Stage 1 as the duplication of the track under the bridge would not take place until Stage 2 of the Project. The provision of additional road infrastructure will be coordinated by the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
31	137	Project design	Road works	A new access road should also be constructed between the Westminster Street Bridge and Grange Avenue, as shown in Figure 3-12 in the Environmental Assessment.	This is outside the proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project. The provision of additional road infrastructure will be coordinated by the Strategies and Land Release Branch, BCC and RTA.
32	138	Project design	Station facilities and interchanges	There is no proposed additional car parking in Riverstone, despite the need for it.	Refer to Section 3.2.5 (*sub-issue 2*) of the report.
32	139	Project design	Station facilities, car parks and interchanges	More commuter car parking is required on both sides of Riverstone Station, especially on the western side within the Riverstone West Precinct bear Richards Avenue, for the current and future residents in Marsden Park and west Riverstone area, to promote public transport.	Refer to Section 3.2.5 (*sub-issue 2*) of the report.
32	140	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic	There is no need for Marsden Park and west Riverstone residents to mix with shopping traffic from the eastern side of Riverstone Station to find a car park and catch a train. It only adds to traffic congestion to the shopping area.	Noted. Refer to Section 3.2.5 (*sub-issue 2 and sub-issue 3*) of the report.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
32	141	Project design	Station facilities, car parks and interchanges	There is only a limited amount of car parking spaces available in Riverstone and with the increase in population we need more spaces.	Noted. Refer to Section 3.2.5 (*sub-issue 2*) of the report.
33	142	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	Concerned about the Bridge Street access road to the new Schofields Station.	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street.
33	143	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	There are a lot of children who play and ride their bikes on Bridge Street.	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street.
33	144	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	The sharp turn at the bottom of Bridge Street is dangerous as drivers cut the corner and cannot be seen coming.	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street. Refer to TIDC's response to submission 3 (ref. no. 6) for further discussion.
33	145	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	Bridge Street has terrible lighting.	Noted.
33	146	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	People speed down Bridge Street.	Noted.
33	147	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	If cars are parked on either side of Bridge Street, then the road is too narrow.	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street.
33	148	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	What will TIDC do about the above raised issues to make the Bridge Street access road safe for residents?	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street. Refer to TIDC's response to submission 3 (ref. no. 6) for further discussion.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
34	149	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Bridge Street is not suitable for use as a construction access route for heavy construction machinery and structures such as girders because the street is already too populated, it is narrow, has sharp curves.	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) for further discussion. At the time significant sized deliveries are required (e.g. girders, plant) the Vernon Road access will be arranged. Oversize deliveries are required to be undertaken with approval by the nominated road authority prior to delivery.
34	150	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	The use of Bridge Street as a construction road would result in extra noise and inconvenience to residents.	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) affecting Bridge Street. Management measures regarding impacts to amenity during construction works have been addressed and will be detailed in the Project's Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Measures such as restricting work to standard construction hours and prior notification to residents of construction schedule and need to carry out 'noisy' works will be including in the CEMP.
34	151	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Opposes the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted. Refer to Section 3.2.2 for the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station.
35	152	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Object to the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted. Refer to Section 3.2.2 for the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station.
35	153	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Resident moved to the area to be near a railway station so that they could use the public infrastructure without relying on a Motor Vehicle.	Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Sub-issue 1 of Section 3.2.1 addresses accessibility issues. Design measures such as the shared user path and the provision of bike racks are included in the concept design plans for the Project.
35	154	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Have paid taxes for the services that are being taken away.	Noted. The relocation of Schofields Station is necessary to allow for the delivery of improved reliability of, and accessibility to, rail services. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. The Project aims to improve the rail infrastructure for the existing and future populations of the NWGC.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
36	155	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Using Bridge Street as a construction access road will impact on the lifestyle of residents.	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street. Refer to TIDC's response to submission 3 (ref. no. 6) for further discussion.
36	156	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Bridge Street is a quiet area and has lots of children who play near the road.	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street. Refer to TIDC's response to submission 3 (ref. no. 6) for further discussion.
36	157	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	The parking of construction machinery and staff vehicles in the area will increase safety risks to children in Bridge Street.	As noted in Section 3.2.3 (*sub-issue 1*) of the report, parking for all construction vehicles (including machinery and staff vehicles) working at the RLA construction compound (i.e. site of the new Schofields Station) will be provided within the construction compound.
36	158	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Residents did not ask for a new Station.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station.
36	159	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	Bridge Street residents will be impacted the greatest by the Project due to Bridge Street becoming an access road.	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street. Section 4.2.1 provides an overview of the predicted traffic noise levels during with discussion provided on the mitigation of operational traffic noise.
36	160	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	The access route to the new Schofields Station should be Vernon Road, as originally planned.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 31 (ref. no. 133).
37	161	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Objects to the closure of existing Schofields Station as it is unnecessary.	Noted. Refer to Section 3.2.2 for the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
37	162	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	There are numerous examples of Stations within Sydney that are located within 1 km of each other, which function adequately.	Noted. Refer to Section 3.2.2 for the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station.
37	163	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	New Schofields Station will be closer to 1 km away from the existing station (measures mid-platform to mid-platform), rather than 800 metres, as claimed in the Environmental Assessment.	Noted. The distance in the Environmental Assessment refers to approximately 800m in extra walking distance. The walking distance from existing station entrance to the relocated station entrance is approximately 865m, and the exact distance will be confirmed during detailed design.
37	164	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	There is much less slope of the line at the present station than many other stations and is in no way a problem for drivers, contrary to what is stated in the Environmental Assessment.	Noted. The considerations to relocate Schofields Station have been discussed in Section 3.2.2 which provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. The 'sporadic' overshooting of the trains at Schofields Station currently was one of the many considerations made as part of the decision to relocate. The relocation results in a benefit concerning trains overshooting the platform; however this factor alone did not form a major component of the drivers behind relocating Schofields Station.
37	165	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	The existing Schofields Station has never been subject to flooding, as inferred in the Environmental Assessment.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 83).
37	166	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	A second track could be neatly accommodated instead of the present station carpark and the proposed pedestrian bridge used to provide station access.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113) regarding the preferred option to relocate Schofields Station rather than update the current station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
37	167	Project design	Footbridge design	The orientation of the ramps on the proposed Schofields footbridge should be facing south, not north, to allow for the slope. The connection from the middle ramp to the island platform could replace use of steps and the need to replace the car park, hence saving costs and the need to decommission the station.	Revised design includes the footbridge in new location (refer Submission 4, ref no. 10) with eastern ramp facing north and western access ramp facing south (as suggested). There are no stairs included nor is there proposed access to the island platform as the platform is to be decommissioned and removed. Section 3.2.2 (refer to sub-issue 3) provides reasons for the decommissioning of Schofields Station.
37	168	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Building the new Schofields pedestrian footbridge, and removing the existing station car park would comprise the only extra costs required to retain existing Schofields Station.	Section 3.2.2 of the report addresses the reasons for not retaining the existing Schofields Station; including the need to decommission the station at the completion of Stage 1 (*refer to sub-issue 3 in Section 3.2.2*). Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113) regarding the preferred option to relocate Schofields Station rather than update the current station.
37	169	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The existing Schofields Station would still be used as there is a growing shopping centre and the expanding township will have a much greater population under the NWGC plan for the proposed Riverstone precinct.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 37 (ref. no. 168); submission no. 16 (ref. no. 59) and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113).
37	170	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Existing Schofields Station would neatly fit between Riverstone Station and the proposed Schofields Station, which should be renamed Nirimba to reflect	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station, including reference to sub-issue 1 which addresses the development of the preferred project option.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
				its location at the former naval airbase.	
37	171	Project design	Riverstone Station upgrade	Why is the existing siding track on the western side of Riverstone Station being retained? It serves no purpose and has not been used for decades and it has no historic value as all equipment has been cleared off the site.	The existing siding track at Riverstone Station is proposed to be refurbished to allow it to be used for the stabling of trains. The use of this facility would enable broken down trains to be removed from the network to allow other train services to continue, thus improving reliability of rail services on the Richmond Branch Line. It would also be used for temporary storage of maintenance equipment.
37	172	Project design	Riverstone Station upgrade	The existing disused siding at Riverstone Station should be removed and the land used as a commuter car park for Riverstone Station.	Section 3.2.5 (*refer to sub-issue 2*) of the report details the Project scope of works at Riverstone Station. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 37 (ref. no. 171) for further discussion on the disused siding.
37	173	Water quality and hydrology	Flooding	The Richmond Line could be protected against the benchmark 1 in 100 year flood, as far as Windsor. The line could stay open by raising the level crossing track section down to the nearby (hotel) culvert by less than 1 metre, and the Mill Street culvert and approaches just north of the station over a small gully by about the same level to clear such floods.	Noted.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
37	174	Project design	Footbridge design	Pedestrian underpasses should be used instead of the more expensive and unsightly bridge and stairways. Both Schofields and Vineyard stations could accommodate this as they are being built into a slight incline away from the existing track and above flood levels.	Noted. The footprint required to enable the underpasses to be constructed whilst achieving the objective of maintaining a safe access way under the rail (with minimal ramp slope and clear pedestrian sight lines) would exceed the area available, at Schofields. In addition due to the required invert level of the underpass it would be below the flood level (i.e. in the 50 yr and 100 yr ARI event the underpass will be submerged in water). A pedestrian underpass at Vineyard could be considered for stage 2 providing this design element doesn't preclude development of the Riverstone, Riverstone West and Vineyard Precinct Plans, as determined by the Strategies and Land Release Branch.
37	175	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The Melbourne Metro network successfully uses a number of unmanned stations, rather than removing these stations from the network.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Sub-issue 3 addresses the reasons for why the station needs to be decommissioned.
38	176	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Objects to the Project, particularly the proposal to relocate Schofields Station.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station.
38	177	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Bought property as it was close to a station.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Section 3.2.1 also addresses the socio-economic impacts to residents (refer to sub-issue 3).
38	178	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	A number of residents near the existing Schofields Station are elderly and rely on the trains.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Reference to sub-issue 3 addresses the socio-economic impacts to residents. Reference to sub-issue 1 addresses accessibility impacts.
38	179	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Moving the station to empty land doesn't make sense.	Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
38	180	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Build a new station to service the NWGC.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Section 3.2.2 of the report also addresses the development of the preferred Project option (refer to sub-issue 1).
39	181	Support for the Project	–	Supports the duplication of the Richmond Line.	Noted.
39	182	Socio-economic	Community cohesion	The new Station to be constructed 800 metres of the existing Schofields Station must not be called Schofields, to prevent the perception of a 'New Schofields' and 'Old Schofields' within the community.	Noted. It is expected that the implementation of the Strategies and Land Release Branch's revitalisation plan will reinforce the Schofield village centre's role as a neighbourhood centre within the Riverstone precinct. As such, the relocation of Schofields Station is not expected to impact on the cohesion of the Schofields community. As per TIDC's response to submission no. 12 (ref. no. 42), the relocated station would retain its name as Schofields Station as it would remain within the Schofields suburb boundary.
39	183	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Existing Schofields Station must remain operational until Stage 2 of the Project is completed. This would allow State rail to accurately audit the actual number of commuters that would continue to use the existing Schofields Station.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Sub-issue 3 addresses the reasons for why the station needs to be decommissioned at the completion of Stage 1.
39	183a	Project design	Footbridge design	The pedestrian footbridge upgrade for Riverstone Station should be relocated to the northern end of the station.	Noted. This would be considered during the detailed design in consultation with the RTA, the Strategies and Land Release Branch, the Heritage Branch of the Department of Planning, RailCorp and MoT.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
40	184	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	The option of building a new Station at Nirimba, and upgrading the current Schofields Station has never been properly assessed. No proper environmental assessment has been undertaken for other options and a lot of statements made in the environmental assessment are base on assumptions.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Sub-issue 1 addresses the development of the preferred Project option. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105). The Environmental Assessment assesses assessed a preferred option, rather than each option provided. The option selection process is completed prior to the Environmental Assessment as a means to determine a preferred option to be assessed in greater detail.
40	185	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	A proper environmental assessment should be conducted regarding the benefits of building a new Station at Nirimba and upgrading the current Schofields Station.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station with sub-issue 1 addressing the development of the preferred Project option. As stated earlier in TIDC's response to submission no. 40 (ref. no. 184) the Environmental Assessment is focussed on assessing the preferred option and does not attempt to assess a range of proposals. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 80) and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105). Chapter 5 of the EA details the design options considered and provides a justification of why the preferred option was selected. Chapter 6 provides the project detail, which is the subject of the Environmental Assessment. As stated earlier in TIDC's response to submission no. 40 (ref. no. 185), the Environmental Assessment is focussed on assessing the preferred option and does not attempt to assess a range of proposals.
40	186	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Blacktown Council and Schofields residents overwhelmingly favour the option for an additional station being built at Nirimba, as this option would provide better access to public transport to all the current and future residents in the area.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Sub-issue 1 addresses the development of the preferred Project option and sub-issue 2 refers the reasons justifying the preferred project option. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 80) and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
40	187	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The current proposal is detrimental to the majority of the Schofields residents.	Noted. Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Sub-issue 3 addresses the socio-economic impacts to residents. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 3 (ref. no. 5), no. 4 (ref. no. 9) and no. 5 (ref. no. 13 and 14).
40	188	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic	Bridge Street is unsuitable for 100 cars passing in a span of 10 to 15 minutes.	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the impacts to Bridge Street during operation (refer sub-issue 2). This section of the report revisits the traffic noise impacts to Bridge Street residents as assessed in the EA's Noise and Vibration Assessment (refer Technical Paper 2 in Volume 2 of the EA) and further investigated in an addendum to the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication Noise and Vibration Assessment for Construction and Operations (refer Section 4.1.2 and Appendix F). The passing of cars is therefore likely to be over an estimated two hour period in peak times only. The two hour period is considered to be the time it would take to park 120 vehicles in the provided car park on the western side of the station. This equates to 120 to 150 vehicle movements over a two hour period rather than the suggested 100 cars passing in a 10 to 15 minute timeframe. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 9 (ref. no. 32). Section 4.2.1 provides a discussion on the mitigation of operational traffic noise.
40	189	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Bridge Street is not suitable for heavy trucks to be moving all the material for the construction of the new Schofields Station.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) and no. 30 (ref. no. 127). Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer sub-issue 1*), such as construction routes affecting Bridge Street. Table 3-3 provides the construction traffic strategy, with Figure 4-1 and 4-2 providing the construction access routes and compound locations proposed to be used during construction.
40	190	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	All traffic should be diverted through a new track extending west to Vernon Road, Argowan Road and Grange Avenue (mentioned in the Environmental Assessment as the 'alternative route'), as there	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer sub-issue 1*), such as construction routes affecting Bridge Street. Table 3-3 provides the construction traffic strategy, with Figure 4-1 and 4-2 providing the construction access routes and compound locations proposed to be used during construction. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) and no. 30 (ref. no. 127).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
				are very few residences which are located further from the road.	
40	191	Construction	Construction compounds	The gate to the RLA compound should be located at the end of the new track extending west to Vernon Road.	The RLA Compound will be secured with a security construction gate directly adjacent to the compound facility at site of new Schofields and at the end of the access road onto Vernon Road.
40	192	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	No access should be provided through Bridge Street.	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 9 (ref. no. 32).
40	193	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	There are a number of discrepancies in the Environmental assessment. Table 8-2 lists new track extending west to Vernon Road as the proposed access and Bridge Street as the alternative route. However, chapter 10.3.6 lists Bridge Street as the main access route and Vernon Road as the alternative route.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) and no. 30 (ref. no. 127). Section 4.2.1 discusses clarifications to the EA, with particular reference to construction access concerning Bridge Street and Vernon Road. Figure 4-1 and 4-2 provides confirmation on the proposed construction access routes.
40	194	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	Although all the future developments have been planned east from the track, the parking capacity at Schofields Station is almost the same at both the eastern and western car parks.	Noted. The current concept plans cater for a total of 230 car parking spaces located on both the eastern and western sides of the new station. These concept plans (to be refined during the detailed design phase) does not preclude the provision of additional parking if demand requires it in the future.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
				The proposed car park on the eastern side of the station is too small as it will cater for most residents of Eastern Schofields, who will no longer be able to walk to the Station.	
40	195	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	With inadequate parking on the eastern side of Schofields Station, it is likely that to get to the western car park, cars will travel through the already overstretched Westminster Bridge. This bridge is scheduled for reconstruction in Stage 2 of the Project and only 2 lanes have been proposed.	Noted. If all cars accessed the parking area for 120 vehicles, excluding commuters using the kiss and ride facility on the western side via Westminster bridge this would result in a minimum 240 additional vehicle movements per day. This is a conservative amount and is not likely to impact on traffic operations at Westminster Bridge. The Strategies and Land Release Branch are proposing major road network changes in the future that would likely change the access roads to the station. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. 54 in Table D (refer Appendix D) which provides further response to the future treatment of Westminster Bridge. The design development process has resulted in a shift of carpark numbers from east to west side to meet the objective of 230 car parks. The original proposal of 90 on the west and 120 on the east has been revised to result in the current figures of 90 on the east and 120 on the west. The reason for the change results from the limited area available on the east and the request by RailCorp's Disability Services Dept to incorporate accessibility ramps which further limited area available for car parks. Consequently, some of the car parking spaces were shifted to the west side where the same area constraints do not exist.
40	196	Noise and vibration	Noise mitigation	Better consideration should be given to noise mitigation measures. The Environmental Assessment mentions only 6 houses in Schofields which may need building treatment; however most of the houses in Bridge Street are exposed to	A detailed noise and vibration assessment was completed as part of the Environmental Assessment. The noise and vibration assessment considered, in detail, the likely noise trigger levels that would apply to the Project, as specified in the Department of Climate Change's (2007) *Interim Guideline for the Assessment of Rail Noise Infrastructure Projects* (IGANRIP). The noise and vibration assessment also indentified locations where operational rail noise levels are predicted to exceed the IGANRIP trigger levels. In summary, these locations included 6 residential receivers located on Bridge

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
				similar noise levels. Noise barriers should be considered for the entire length of Bridge Street, not just near the houses which are very close to the track.	Street. At locations where IGANRIP trigger levels are predicted to be exceeded, as part of the detailed design process the next phase of the operational noise assessment will be completed to reassess the operational noise levels and determine the "reasonable and feasible" mitigation to be implemented to ensure compliance with IGANRIP. These measures would be developed during detailed design in consultation with DECC and affected land owners. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 11 (ref. no. 37). As stated in SoC no. 26 (refer Table 6-1 of this document), *the Proponent would prepare an Operational Noise and Vibration Report for the Project. The report would include predictions of operational noise and vibration levels (including ground-borne noise levels) at sensitive receivers based on the detailed design of the Project, and confirm all reasonable and feasible noise and vibration mitigation measures that would be implemented for the Project in accordance with the Interim Guidelines for the Assessment of Noise from Rail Infrastructure Projects (DECC 2007)*. In addition, SoC no. 27 states that *following completion of construction, operational noise monitoring shall be undertaken to confirm compliance with the predicted noise levels identified in the Environmental Assessment. Should the results of monitoring show that the Project specific noise levels are exceeded then any additional feasible and reasonable mitigation measures shall be implemented in consultation with the affected property owners*.
40	197	Project design	Footbridge design	Access stairs to the new Schofields Station should face north, as this is the direction most pedestrians would be approaching it.	The access stairs to the new Schofields Station will are proposed to face north to link up with the shared user path that is proposed between the existing and new Schofields Stations.
40	198	Project design	Road works	Speed bumps should be installed on Bridge Street which will function as the only access road to the western car park.	Bridge Street is a local road that is owned by Blacktown City Council. As such, the installation of speed abatement devices would require Council's concurrence. Section 3.2.3 (*refer sub-issue 2*) of the report provides an overview of the operational impacts on Bridge Street. As discussed in this section, the Richmond Line Alliance's initial operational traffic and safety assessment of Bridge Street has concluded that the installation of Local Area Traffic

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					Management (LATM) devices (speed abatement devices) will not be required as the access road to the western car park does not connect to any other part of the road network and is, therefore, not a “through” road. The road therefore operates under an existing low speed residential speed zoning arrangement. During detailed design, investigations will be taken in consultation with Blacktown City Council to review this initial finding. If such devices are determined to be warranted, these road treatments would be provided in consultation with Blacktown City Council.
40	199	Project design	Road works	Parking restrictions should be introduced on Bridge Street, so that cars can only park on one side of the road, as there is no room for two cars to be parked on both sides of the road, and two cars travelling in opposite directions.	Bridge Street is a local road that is owned by Blacktown City Council. As such, Council is responsible for implementing parking controls to this road.
40	200	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	Consultation period was too short. 30 days were not long enough to review such a complex and lengthy document. The consultation period should be extended.	Refer to TIDC’s response to submission no. 21 (ref. no. 97).
41	201	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Concerned about the closure and relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted. Refer to TIDC’s response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 3 (ref. no. 5, 6 and 7), no. 4 (ref. no. 8 and 9). Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the key accessibility, public safety and socio-economic impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station.
41	202	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Closure of Schofields Station will adversely affect residents who bought their properties to be close to public transport.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Reference to sub-issue 3 addresses the socio-economic impacts to residents. Refer to TIDC’s response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 3, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
41	203	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Closure of Schofields Station will make public transport very difficult for many elderly residents to access.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station with sub-issue 1 addressing accessibility impacts. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9).
41	204	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	Bridge Street will require speed abatement devices to protect residents from people speeding on the road and increased traffic flow.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 40 (ref. no. 198).
41	205	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Why has the plans to build a separate station at Nirimba been scrapped? Two stations will give more people access to public transport.	Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Reference to sub-issue 1 addresses the development of the preferred Project option. Further discussion is provided in Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105).
42	206	Socio-economic	Equality	Relocating Schofields Station is unfair to the existing Schofields residents.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Reference to sub-issue 3 addresses the socio-economic impacts to residents. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 11 and 12) and no. 23 (ref. no. 109).
42	207	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Commuting to the new Schofields Station will be more inconvenient.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station with sub-issue 1 addressing accessibility impacts. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5) and no. 4 (ref. no. 9) for further discussion on Schofields Station Transition Plan and Project design respectively.
42	208	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Having to drive to new Schofields Station defeats the purpose of using public transport.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 14).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
42	209	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Does not trust that bus services will be sufficient/convenient to provide access between existing and new Schofields stations.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1).
43	210	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Residents bought their properties to be close to the existing Schofields Station. Relocating the station is not fair to these residents.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 90). Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 3, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).
43	211	Socio-economic	Equality	Relocating Schofields Station to benefit future residents is unfair to the existing residents.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station with sub-issues 1 and 3 addressing accessibility and socio-economic impacts to residents respectively. Further discussion is provided in TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 11 and 12) and no. 23 (ref. no. 109).
43	212	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Elderly residents will be adversely impacted if public transport between the existing and new Schofields stations does not meet their needs.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station with sub-issue 1 addressing accessibility issues. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1).
43	213	Socio-economic	Business viability	The existing Schofields shops will not be able to survive if the existing Schofields Station is closed.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Reference to sub-issue 3 addresses the socio-economic impacts to local businesses. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8).
44	214	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Objects to the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
44	215	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Make the construction access route for the new Schofields Station through Vernon Road, as it would be much safer for the children and pedestrians that use Bridge Street. This would also result in less noise impacts to Bridge Street residents.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116), no. 30 (ref. no. 127 and 129) and no. 67 (ref. no. 348).
45	216	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The original Schofields Station should be retained. It is in a prime location to support business activities of the Schofields community, school, park and local hall.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Sub-issue 1 addresses the development of the preferred Project option. Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 13) and no. 23 (ref. no. 104 and 105).
45	217	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Build a new rail station at Burdekin Road which will access proposed Alex Avenue development and other developments within the proximity of Burdekin Road.	Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Sub-issue 1 addresses the development of the preferred Project option. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105) for further discussion on the preferred Project option.
45	218	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	No station should be built at Pelican Road (i.e. 800 metres from the original Schofields Station).	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
45	219	Project design	Car parking provisions	Parking at the existing Schofields Station could be increased on Bridge Street, at the corner of Grange Avenue. This would allow pedestrians to access the planned Schofields footbridge.	Noted. Parking will not be retained at the existing Schofields Station beyond Stage 1. The Station is planned to be relocated with extra parking provided for commuters at the new location. As such the commuter car park at Schofields Village will be closed and the area rehabilitated in accordance with the Urban Design and Landscape Plan. Community and stakeholder's will be consulted in the development of this strategy.
44	220	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The existing Schofields Station has adequate disabled access and does not need any further improvements.	Noted. Whilst the existing station may have adequate access facilities, the reasons for relocating Schofields Station have been based on various reasons which outweigh the option of retaining Schofields Station in its current location. Please refer to Section 3.2.2 of the report which provides the justification for relocating Schofields Station. Further, the existing station wouldn't be able to service the additional track.
45	221	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	No construction access should be provided via Bridge Street. The road has a 5 tonne load limit and access via this road would impinge disastrously on the residential area.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116), no. 30 (ref. no. 127 and 129) and no. 67 (ref. no. 348).
45	222	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Bridge Street is unsuitable for heavy vehicles as is too narrow and has two narrow bends.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 34 (ref. no. 116149) and no. 30 (ref. no. 127).
45	223	Project design	Car parking provisions	If parking was increased on the Bridge Street side of existing Schofields Station, then there would be no need to build a new parking area at the end of Bridge Street.	During the EA preparation and consultation program for the Project, a number of community members requested that access be provided to the station from the western side of the rail corridor. The design of the Project was modified in response to this community feedback and it was determined Bridge Street would provide the most direct access on the western side. Section 4.3 of the Environmental Assessment's Traffic and Transport Technical Paper indicates a high demand for parking near stations. The predicted substantial increase in absolute demand for car parking can be attributed to the

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					large level of growth proposed in the NWGC. The forecasts already assume a large shift to bus access to the stations. For example, Schofields currently has a bus mode share near 0%, whereas in 2031, it is assumed to be 22%. The large demand for car parking at these stations would require the construction of significant parking infrastructure to meet demand. It is not recommended that this demand be matched through the construction of large parking structures near each station. Rather, the demand could be met by providing parking along the rail line as a whole. This would involve nominating some stations as park-and-ride stations and others as public transport interchange stations. Typically, the latter would be stations near high activity areas while the former would be stations with good road network links. Relocating Schofields Station and placing car parking facilities on the western side was proposed based on a long-term view to cater for future demand. Upgrading Schofields Station in its current location and increasing parking on the western side of the station would not meet future demand in the longer term.
45	224	Project design	Road works	All the needs of existing Schofields Station can be accessed through Railway Terrace, Schofields Road and Windsor Road, therefore alleviating any disruption to the existing residents of Bridge Street and the surrounding residential area.	Noted. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 45 (ref. no. 223). Access to the western side (Bridge Street) would eventually be required in the long term. Access on the western side also enables residents in Bridge street and surrounding streets to reduce the potential walking distance to access the new station if only eastern side access was provided.
45	225	Socio-economic	Equality	Planning for the Project has forgotten about the existing residents and business community of Schofields. The impact of this project will have on the residents and businesses will be everlasting and disastrous.	Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station with sub-issue 1 addressing accessibility impacts, sub-issue 2 dealing with the public safety impacts and sub-issue 3 concentrating on the socio-economic impacts. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station with reference to sub-issue 1 addressing the development of the preferred Project option. Refer further to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 11 and 12) and no. 23 (ref. no. 109).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
46	226	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Construction traffic access to the new Schofields Station should be via Vernon Road as originally planned, not via Bridge Street.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) and no. 30 (ref. no. 127). Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (refer sub-issue 1), such as construction routes affecting Bridge Street. Table 3-3 provides the construction traffic strategy, with Figure 4-1 and 4-2 providing the construction access routes and compound locations proposed to be used during construction.
47	227	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Strongly objects to the closure of existing Schofields Station.	Noted.
47	228	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Depend on being able to walk to the station and as such would be greatly disadvantaged if the station is relocated.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9). Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station with sub-issue 1 addressing accessibility impacts.
47	229	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	No objection to the construction of a new station as planned, but cannot understand why the removal of the current station is necessary.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Reference to sub-issue 3 addresses the reasons for why the station needs to be decommissioned. Refer further to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 104 and 105).
47	230	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	There are other stations that are close to each other, so why upset and inconvenience so many long-term existing residents.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report discusses the impact on residents including impacts property prices (sub-issue 3) and accessibility (sub-issue 1). Section 3.2.2 provides the justification for relocating Schofields Station. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 37 (ref. no. 168), no. 16 (ref. no. 59) and no. 23 (ref. no. 104, 105 and 109).
47	231	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Construct the new Station and name it 'Nirimba' as originally planned, and leave the current Schofields Station operational.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Reference to sub-issue 3 addresses the reasons for why the station needs to be decommissioned. Refer further to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105). Also refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 104 and 105).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
48	232	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Opposes the use of Bridge Street as a construction access route due to adverse dirt and noise impacts it will have on the residential area.	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) affecting Bridge Street. Management measures regarding impacts to amenity during construction works have been addressed and will be detailed in the Project's Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) regarding predominance of light construction vehicles accessing Bridge Street. This should minimise impacts such as noise and air quality during construction. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref no 6), submission no 9, (ref no 32) and submission no. 40, (ref no. 188) for further information on noise impacts.
48	233	Construction	Working hours	No works to be undertaken early in the morning, or late in the night, or on weekends.	Noted. As described in SoC no. 25, *Construction activities will be undertaken between the hours of 0700 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 Saturday and no work on Sundays or public holidays, except as otherwise provided for in the Environmental Protection Licence for the Project, TIDC's Construction Noise Strategy (Rail Projects), or as agreed with relevant authorities*. Where works are required in the rail corridor or on public roads, the construction activities may periodically need to completed outside these hours. Where possible, the constructor will schedule works such that activities likely to impact residents will be undertaken in the middle parts of the day. However (subject to approval process and community notification measures), it is likely that essential works may be required to be undertaken at evening and nights (as per RailCorp works). These may still be noisy and all reasonable and feasible mitigation measures will be applied to limit the intensity and duration of the impact on community.
48	234	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	All construction vehicles and machinery should be parked at the end of the street and out of the way.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 36 (ref. no. 157).
48	235	Socio-economic	Employment generation	Provide work for local residents of the area during construction.	Noted.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
49	236	Project design	Station design, visual treatments and landscaping	The proposed designs are disgusting and devoid of imagination and style.	Refer TIDC's response to submission no. 7 (ref. no. 21).
49	237	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Relocating the existing Schofields Station is unfair to the residents who have bought property to be close to a station.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission 20, ref no. 90. Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 3, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).
49	238	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Will the proposed bus service cater for disabled passengers and patrons? How will this bus service be funded?	This is a MoT issue and Section 3.2.1 (sub issue 1) of the report discusses accessibility impacts related to relocation of Schofields Station. The bus service will be provided by private operators, and as such, the private operator would be responsible for providing disabled access provisions. It is likely to be a 'user pays' service, however MoT will determine this. Refer to TIDC's responses to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1) and no. 14 (ref. no. 47) for further discussion on the Schofields Station Transition Plan and the review of bus services as part of this plan.
50	239	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Strongly objects to the removal of existing Schofields Station.	Noted.
50	240	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Requests that existing Schofields upgraded at the existing location.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Reference to sub-issue 1 addresses the development of the preferred Project option. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 12) and no. 5 (ref. no. 13).
50	241	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Strongly object to the use of Bridge Street as a construction access road.	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (refer sub-issue 1), such as construction routes affecting Bridge Street. Table 3-3 provides the construction traffic strategy, with Figure 4-1 and 4-2 providing the construction access routes and compound locations proposed to be used during construction. Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) and no. 30 (ref. no. 127).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
50	242	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Vernon Road should be used as the construction access road as originally planned.	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (refer sub-issue 1), such as construction routes affecting Bridge Street. Table 3-3 provides the construction traffic strategy, with Figure 4-1 and 4-2 providing the construction access routes and compound locations proposed to be used during construction. Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) and no. 30 (ref. no. 127).
50	243	Socio-economic	Equality	The current proposal has no benefits for the existing Schofields community.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Discussion responding to sub-issue 2 addresses discusses the development of the preferred Project option, with sub-issue 2 providing the reasoning behind the selection of the preferred option to relocate Schofields Station. There are benefits for the wider community, as detailed in Section 3.2.1. This Section also provides a discussion on the socio-economic impacts as rasied by local businesses and residents. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 35 (ref. no. 154), no. 23 (ref. no. 106), no. 57 (ref. no. 277), no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 3 (ref. no. 5), no. 4 (ref. no. 9) and no. 5 (ref. no. 13 and 14).
51	244	Project design	Riverstone Station upgrade	The planned upgrade of Riverstone Station does not incorporate additional parking spaces. This should be considered to meet the expected demand as a result of population growth in the area.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 29 (ref. no 126).
52	245	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Relocating Schofields Station will make it difficult for elderly and disabled residents to access rail services.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Sub-issue Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9) addresses the accessibility impacts associated with the proposed relocation of Schofields Station. Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1) regarding the Schofields Station Transition Plan.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
52	246	Socio-economic	Property values	House prices will plummet as being located close to a rail station is a valuable selling point.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 90). Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 107).
52	247	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Using Bridge Street as an access road will result in an increase in noise, create difficulty to access local roads and would be dangerous for children who play on the side of the road.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) and no. 30 (ref. no. 127) related to construction impacts. Refer to Section 3 and TIDC's response to submission 9, ref 32 for operational impacts. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) affecting Bridge Street. Management measures regarding impacts to amenity during construction works have been addressed and will be detailed in the Project's Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).
52	248	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Vernon Road should be used as the access road to the Station.	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (refer sub-issue 1), such as construction routes affecting Bridge Street. Table 3-3 provides the construction traffic strategy, with Figure 4-1 and 4-2 providing the construction access routes and compound locations proposed to be used during construction. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) and submission no. 30 (ref. no. 127).
53	249	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	Opposes to using Bridge Street as an access road to new Schofields Station as the road is too narrow and the S-bend is very narrow.	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (*refer to sub-issue 1*) and operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 34 (ref. no. 149). Also refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 9 (ref. no. 32).
53	250	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	Children play on and around Bridge Street.	Noted.
53	251	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Vernon Road should be used as an access road instead of Bridge Street.	Section 3.2.3 of the report details the construction impacts (refer sub-issue 1), such as construction routes affecting Bridge Street. Table 3-3 provides the construction traffic strategy, with Figure 4-1 and 4-2 providing the construction access routes and compound locations proposed to be used during construction.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) and no. 30 (ref. no. 127).
54	252	Objection to the project	–	Opposes to the relocation of Schofields Station. Schofields Station could be like Quakers Hill Station.	Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Sub-issue 1 addresses the development of the preferred Project option.
55	253	Objection to the project	–	Opposes to the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication.	Noted.
55	254	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	The new location of Schofields Station is outside the Schofields Central Business District and away from the majority of local residents which would have a negative impact for the majority of residents.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Sub-issue 3 discusses the socio-economic impacts to local businesses, residents and the wider community. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 3 (ref. no. 5), no. 4 (ref. no. 9) and no. 5 (ref. no. 13).
55	255	Noise and vibration	Operational noise impacts	Train noise will dramatically increase in the area as a result of increased train services. No consideration has been made for residences located upon Railway Terrace, or within close proximity to the railway line.	Consideration was made to residences and sensitive receivers close to railway corridor. The sensitive receivers considered to be impacted by operational rail noise included Manorhouse Boulevard, Bridge Street and Tain Place. Railway Terrace homes were not identified as experiencing exceedances in the IGANRIP trigger levels. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 60 (ref. no. 301), no. 40 (ref. no. 196), no. 31 (ref. no. 135) and no. 11 (ref. no. 37).
55	256	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impact	Traffic along Railway Terrace will dramatically increase as a result of creating 220 car spaces and bus services at Schofields Train Station.	Noted. Section 8.4 of the Environmental Assessment and the Addendum to the Noise and Vibration Assessment (See Appendix F) addresses the impacts from operational road noise. The latter report provides an assessment of noise generated by vehicles commuting to and from the car parking facilities at both the Schofields and Vineyard Stations. The eastern car park at Schofields Station would be accessed via Railway Terrace, which is already subject to large volumes of traffic. The increase in traffic numbers on this road as a result of vehicles accessing the car parking

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					facilities would be minimal and as such, the noise level increase would be considered negligible. The Addendum to the Noise and Vibration Assessment (See Appendix F) presents the predicted 2023 receiver noise levels due to vehicle passbys at the closest property situated on Bridge Street. A sensitivity analysis was performed in order to show how the noise level varies as the number of vehicles accessing the western car park via Bridge Street increases. This assessment has mapped the Environmental Criteria for Road Traffic Noise (ECRTN) 55 dBA $L_{Aeq(1hour)}$ local road criterion. At greater than 53 vehicle movements along Bridge Street in the worst-case 1 hour period, the criterion is exceeded. The report notes that the western car park at Schofields Station is noted as having capacity for 120 vehicles. The report assumes that half of these spaces would be filled in the worst-case 1 hour period, resulting in, potentially, 60 hourly vehicle movements. The noise levels are therefore predicted to exceed the $L_{Aeq(1hour)}$ 55 dBA criteria, however it should be noted that this exceedance is marginal (0.6 dBA). Furthermore, a change of 1 dBA or 2 dBA in the level of a sound is difficult, if not impossible, for people to detect, whilst a 3 dBA to 5 dBA change corresponds to a small but noticeable change in loudness. On this basis the 0.6 dBA exceedance of the ECRTN criteria is considered acceptable.
55	257	Traffic and transport	Traffic noise	Increased traffic on Railway Terrace will increase noise pollution suffered by residences located along this road.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 55 (ref. no. 256).
55	258	Socio-economic	Property values	Property will now be 1.7 kilometres away from Schofields Station, which will greatly devalue the value of the property.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 90). Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 107).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
55	259	Socio-economic	Property values	Increased traffic on Railway Terrace and Westminster Street Bridge will also devalue value of property as it will obstruct views.	Noted. See TIDC's response to submission no. 55 (ref no. 256).
55	260	Socio-economic	Property values	Properties located within close proximity to the existing Schofields Station will be reduced in value.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 90). Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 107).
55	261	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Railway Terrace, Bridge Street and Grange Avenue are unable to sustain the amount of additional traffic which would result from the completion of the Project as they are pitted with pot holes and in disrepair.	During construction, the contractor is required to 'make good' any damage resulting from the construction of the project on roads and associated structures. The maintenance of these roads currently resides with the road authority which owns the asset. TIDC will continue to work with the RTA, Strategies and Land Release Branch and other agencies regarding operation of the Project and will not preclude the future demands of the population as the NWGC develops. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 48 (ref. no. 232) for further details related to Bridge Street traffic.
55	262	Socio-economic	Business viability	Relocating Schofields Station decreases the convenience of access to the local Schofields shops and may decrease the amount of patrons that visit them.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station with sub-issue 1 addressing accessibility impacts and sub-issue 3 discussing the socio-economic impacts to local businesses and residents. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8).
56	263	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Objects to the Project, particularly the moving of Schofields Station.	Noted.
56	264	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Would have to walk 10 minutes to access the station.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station with sub-issue 1 addressing accessibility impacts. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 3 (ref. no. 5) and no. 4 (ref. no. 9).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
56	265	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Elderly residents use the train station to access medical appointments. The relocation of Schofields Station will reduce the accessibility of the station for these residents.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station with sub-issue 1 addressing accessibility impacts. As part of the Schofields Station Transition Plan, a review of bus services between the existing and new Schofields Station will be included. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 3 (ref. no. 5) and no. 4 (ref. no. 9).
56	266	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	More vehicles will drive over the Westminster Street Bridge and Bridge Street to access parking on the western side of the Station.	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 9 (ref. no. 32).
56	267	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	The existing configuration of Bridge Street is not suitable for large amounts of traffic or heavy buses.	Noted. Section 3.2.3 of the report details the operational impacts (*refer to sub-issue 2*) affecting Bridge Street. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 9 (ref. no. 32).
56	268	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	A new station should be built for the future residents, and the existing Schofields Station should be retained for existing residents.	Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Sub-issue 1 addresses the development of the preferred Project option. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 104 and 105). Sub-issue 2 details the reasons for proposing the relocation of Schofields Station.
56	269	Other	Other road projects	Schofields Road should be upgraded to cross over the rail line to provide access to the new station and join with Richmond Road.	This is outside the proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project. The provision of additional road infrastructure to the NWGC will be coordinated by the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA in consultation with other agencies.
57	270	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Objects to the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
57	271	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	Justifications provided for relocating Schofields Station were misleading.	Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Sub-issue 1 addresses the development of the preferred Project option. The justification for relocating Schofield Station is detailed in TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7). In summary, the decision to relocate Schofields and justification was determined as a 'whole-of-government' approach as an outcome of Strategies and Land Release Branch, MoT, RailCorp and TIDC input.
57	272	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Relocating Schofields Station will result in loss of amenity, land value, access to services and future isolation for Schofields residents.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Section 3.2.2 provides the justification for relocating Schofields Station. The current Project design features to manage accessibility issues as raised in various submissions. The revitalisation plan for the existing Schofields village is discussed further in Section 3.2.1. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 5 (ref. no. 14), no. 20 (ref. no. 90), no. 16 (ref. no. 59) and no. 4 (ref. no. 7).
57	273	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Will have to drive to Schofields Station if it is relocated as there is no regular bus service on the Bridge Street side of the line.	Refer to Section 3.2.1 which discusses accessibility impacts and design considerations. The Schofields Station Transition Plan is highlighted in this section and referenced in TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1) and no. 5 (ref. no. 14).
57	274	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Using a bus service to access the station will incur additional transport costs that residents shouldn't have to pay.	Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1) regarding the provision of a bus service. Other forms of transport provided as a result of the Project include a shared user path between the existing Schofields Station and the new station to encourage pedestrian and bicycle access. Bike racks will be provided, 20 on each side of the station and concrete padmounts will be provided to enable the provision of bike lockers. Additional car parking facilities are also provided on both sides of the station for commuters who wish to drive to the station.
57	275	Socio-economic	Property values	There has been no attempt to calculate the impact of relocating Schofields Station on house prices in the area.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 90). Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 107).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
57	276	Socio-economic	Property values	What compensation will be provided to residents adversely affected by the relocation of Schofields Station?	There will be no compensation paid to residents. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission 20 (ref. no. 90). Discussion related to the Schofields Station Transition Plan is provided in sub-issue 1 of Section 3.2.1. Please refer to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1) and submission no. 3 (ref. no. 5) which provides details on bus route reviews by MoT and the provision of a shared user path.
57	277	Socio-economic	Equality	Developers of Alex Avenue will benefit from the relocation of Schofields Station at the expense of existing Schofields residents.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 12).
57	278	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	Bridge Street is not designed as a major traffic thoroughfare. There is little scope for widening the road, or removing the dog-leg stretch near the Station. This is a dangerous compromise for residents and pedestrian traffic.	Noted. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 40 (ref. no. 198).
57	279	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	The justifications provided for the relocation of Schofields Station are insult to the local community, as not one reason validates the relocation, as described below:	As discussed in Section 3.2.2 and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113), the decision for relocating Schofields Station was based on a holistic decision which considered several factors, none of which are considered in isolation. The decision to relocate Schofields Station was based upon advice and input from Strategies and Land Release Branch, MoT, RailCorp and other government agencies.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
57	280	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*Regional and local bus services can focus on one major station, rather than two* There would still need to be a bus service for residents near the existing Schofields Station. Moving the station will create greater pressure on local services.	As discussed in section 3.2.2 and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113), the decision for relocating Schofields Station was based on a holistic decision which considered several factors. TIDC's response to submission 1 (ref. no. 1) provides details on the Schofields Station Transition Plan and the need provide local services as a result of the relocation of Schofields Station. The longer term provision of improved rail infrastructure for existing and future populations is a driver for this project.
57	281	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*Enhance the function of the town centre* Relocating the station will only advantage developers of Alex Avenue. The existing residents will be left with no local shops as their business will be eroded by the new town centre.	As discussed in section 3.2.2 and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113), the decision for relocating Schofields Station was based on a holistic decision which considered several factors. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Sub-issue 3 provides a discussion on the socio-economic impacts affecting local businesses and residents. The Strategies and Land Release Branch have proposed the revitalise the Schofields village centre upon relocation of Schofields Station. As discussed in submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113), the decision for relocating Schofields Station was based on a holistic decision which considered several factors. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8) and submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9).
57	282	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*Even spacing between stations* This is hardly a justification for moving any station in a network that has been developed to meet the needs of residential clusters. Schofields still needs a station.	As discussed in section 3.2.2 and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113), the decision for relocating Schofields Station was based on a holistic decision which considered several factors. The considerations to relocate Schofields Station have been discussed in TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no 7). The 'even spacing between stations was a consideration made as part of the decision to relocate, however this factor alone does not form a major component of the drivers behind relocating Schofields Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
57	283	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*Potentially enable a larger population to live within walking distance of a station* This is potentially not likely to eventuate as the immediate area east of the new Schofields Station will be a town centre, not residential. The western side is impacted by flooding and has no direct road access. The only advantage will be for some workers coming from outside the area to the town centre.	As discussed in section 3.2.2 and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113), the decision for relocating Schofields Station was based on a holistic decision which considered several factors. The considerations to relocate Schofields Station have been discussed in TIDC's response to submission no 4, ref no 7. TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 82) states "One of the justifications of relocating Schofields Station approximately 800m south of its current location acknowledges this option would better support the planned development of the area in reference to the proposed Strategies and Land Release Branch Alex Avenue and Riverstone precincts. The Precincts are being planned so that areas of higher density housing will be concentrated along public transport corridors and most homes will be within 400 metres of public transport. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 17) for further detail.
57	284	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*New Station will provide greater employment opportunities within closer proximity to the station* How is this a justification for relocating the station? This will be an advantage for Alex Avenue developers based on the assumption that the passing trade from rail commuters will provide a business base that would not exist without the station. This shows that the removal of existing Schofields Station will result in loss of advantages to existing businesses.	As discussed in section 3.2.2 and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113), the decision for relocating Schofields Station was based on a holistic decision which considered several factors. TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8) illustrates that the results of the commuter surveys found 13% of commuters accessed the shops at Schofields either prior to or after using the rail station. The findings from the survey however were not able to determine which shops were included in the 13% commuter patronage. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Sub-issue 3 provides a discussion on the socio-economic impacts affecting local businesses, residents and the wider community. As demonstrated in Section 3.2.1, Schofields village, on the basis of these the socio-economic assessment provided in 8.3.4 of the EA survey results, demonstrates that it can sustain itself without reliance on Schofields Station as a providing a major source of commuter trade. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8). Also refer to Section 3.2.1 which discusses the Strategies and Land Release Branch revitalisation plans for Schofields village.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
57	285	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*Increased transport opportunities for Alex Avenue and Riverstone developments* At the expense of and disadvantage to existing residents. Also fails to acknowledge Marsden Park and other developments would feed into the exiting station between Schofields Road and Westminster Street.	As discussed in section 3.2.2 and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113), the decision for relocating Schofields Station was based on a holistic decision which considered several factors. As discussed in submission no. 23 (ref. no. 113), the decision for relocating Schofields Station was based on a holistic decision which considered several factors. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 12), and no. 23 (ref. no. 109).
57	286	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*Integrate commuter car park and bus interchange* Fail to see the significance of an integrated car park and bus service. The 230 parking spaces created by the project is not significant as there is little scope for street parking in the immediate area of the relocated station.	Noted. The current design on either side, particularly the western side of the station does not preclude additional parking spaces from being created in the future as demand requires. The bus interchange caters for those commuters who will not travel to and from the station on foot, bicycle or via private vehicles.
57	287	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*Overshooting the station* This has occurred less than a handful of times over the last 30 years. This is due to driver error rather than an unmanageable risk.	Noted. As TIDC's response to submission no. 37 (ref. no. 164), the 'sporadic' overshooting of the trains at Schofields Station currently was one of the many considerations made as part of the decision to relocate. The relocation results in a benefit concerning trains overshooting the platform; however this factor alone did not form a major component of the drivers behind relocating Schofields Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
57	288	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*New station is not affected by flooding* Neither is the existing station.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 83).
57	289	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*Built away from live tracks* Any station will be built parallel to live tracks, regardless of its location. There are inherent issues when building over tracks for access, regardless of location.	Noted. The new station is able to be primarily built outside of rail possessions and as such the need for out of hours work and construction impact on community is reduced. With the relocation, the works duration for Stage 1 can be shortened. To undertake the same scope at existing Schofields would not present the same benefits and it is likely there would need to be significant night and weekend works and closure of the line. There will still be the need for some project designers are in consultation with RailCorp and possessions where work is planned to be undertaken over live tracks.
57	290	Socio-economic	Business viability	The Environmental Assessment states that the Paint Shop will not be impacted by relocated Schofields Station, however this business has already closed.	Noted. At the time of preparing the Environmental Assessment, this business was present at the Schofields village centre. It is acknowledged that this shop is no longer present at this location and has been replaced with a pet grooming business (*Paws With Panache*). Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8) for further discussion on business viability impacts associated with the relocation of Schofields Station.
57	291	Project design	Car parking provisions	Given the expectations for the project, a multi-storey car park would be required for new Schofields Station.	The demand for commuter car parking is not expected to warrant the construction of a multi-storey car park at the new Schofields Station as part of this Project in the short-term. In addition, the Strategies and Land Release Branch have not released indicative plans for the Schofields precinct. As such it is uncertain what Strategies and Land Release Branch's plans are for this area. The proposed design of new Schofields Station and associated car park/bus interchange facilities do not preclude additional parking spaces from being created in the future as demand requires.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
57	292	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	There is no reasonable explanation as to why the original plans for the project will not proceed (i.e. stations at Nirimba and Schofields).	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105).
57	293	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Existing Schofields Station should be designed to serve both existing and future residents, while a new Nirimba station should be built to serve the needs of new development areas such as the Alex Avenue precinct.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105).
57	294	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	The arguments for a single station seem short sighted.	Please refer to the justification provided in TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7).
57	295	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	The argument that it will take 3 minutes less to get to the city by the removal of existing Schofields Station will not convince those who are being inconvenienced by losing their station.	Noted. The Project aims to improve rail infrastructure for the existing and future populations through increasing train capacities on the Richmond Branch Line between Quakers Hill and Schofields for Stage 1. The completion of Stage 2 will see additional capacity through to Riverstone and Vineyard. Whilst a positive benefit of the Project may be the improved efficiencies in travel time, it is only one of many considerations which determined the selection of the preferred option to relocate the station. Please refer to TIDC response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7) for further justification.
58	296	Project design	Car parking provisions	Requests that a multi-storey carpark be built on the western side of Vineyard and Riverstone Railway stations, with road access to Vineyard Station from Richmond Road.	This is outside the proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 29 (ref. no. 126). Stage 2 of the project is currently deferred to align with the growth of the NWGC, hence these suggestions can be considered in consultation with Strategies and Land Release Branch as part of Stage 2 detailed design, with particular reference to phase 2 of Vineyard car park assessment.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
59	297	Project design	Riverstone Station	No carparking is being provided on the western sides of Riverstone and Vineyard stations. Requests that these are provided.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 29 (ref. no. 126) and submission no. 58 (ref. no. 296).
59	298	Other	Western road access to Vineyard Station.	Requests that a road is constructed to access Vineyard Station from Berkshire Park, Llandilo and Shanes Park.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 21 (ref. no. 98).
59	299	Support for the project	–	Welcomes the upgrade to the rail line and the provision of more train services.	Noted.
60	300	Noise and vibration	Operational noise impact	Has already heard an increase in rail noise as a result of the existing timber sleepers being relaced with new concrete sleepers in the vicinity of Manorhouse Boulevard.	Noted. The proposed noise assessment used results from the existing noise environment that included the concrete sleepers being there. Operational noise impacts resulting from the Project will be managed by TIDC. At locations where IGANRIP trigger levels are predicted to be exceeded, TIDC will further investigate reasonable and feasible mitigation measures to ensure compliance with IGANRIP. This is discussed further in Section 8.4 of the Environmental Assessment. As stated in SoC no. 26 (refer Table 6-1 of this document), *the Proponent would prepare an Operational Noise and Vibration Report for the Project. The report would include predictions of operational noise and vibration levels (including ground-borne noise levels) at sensitive receivers based on the detailed design of the Project, and confirm all reasonable and feasible noise and vibration mitigation measures that would be implemented for the Project in accordance with the Interim Guidelines for the Assessment of Noise from Rail Infrastructure Projects (DECC 2007)*. In addition, SoC no. 27 states that *following completion of construction, operational noise monitoring shall be undertaken to confirm compliance with the predicted noise levels identified in the Environmental Assessment. Should the results of monitoring show that the Project specific noise levels are*

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					exceeded then any additional feasible and reasonable mitigation measures shall be implemented in consultation with the affected property owners
60	301	Noise and vibration	Operational noise impact	Noise levels within the vicinity of Manorhouse Boulevard would double with the increase in train movements as a result of the Project.	This is not correct. The noise and vibration assessment predicted that, for receivers located along Manorhouse Boulevard: ▪ During 2012, noise levels would increase by up to 1 dBA at the nearest receiver locations; and would comply with the noise trigger levels of $L_{Aeq(15\ hour)}$ and $L_{Aeq(9\ hour)}$ 65 dBA at all receivers ▪ During 2012, L_{Amax} noise levels are predicted to increase by less than 3 dBA and as such would comply with the overall IGANRIP noise trigger levels. ▪ During 2023, $L_{Aeq(15\ hour)}$ noise levels are predicted increase by up to 4 dBA and are predicted to exceed the trigger level of 65 dBA at eight receivers immediately facing onto the rail corridor. ▪ During 2023, $L_{Aeq(9\ hour)}$ noise levels are predicted to increase by up to 1 dBA and would comply with the trigger level of 60 dBA for all receivers at this location. ▪ During 2023, L_{Amax} noise levels are predicted to increase by less than 3 dBA and are predicted to exceed the trigger level of 85 dBA at all receivers located on Manorhouse Boulevard that face directly onto the rail corridor. As the 2023 predicted increase in $L_{Aeq(15\ hour)}$ noise levels exceeds the overall IGANRIP noise trigger level. As part of the detailed design process the next phase of the operational noise assessment will be completed to reassess the operational noise levels and determine the "reasonable and feasible" mitigation to be implemented at this location.
60	302	Noise and vibration	Noise mitigation	Requests that a concrete sound proof wall be erected either where the fence line is with an approx height of 2.4 metres, or further down the embankment towards the line with a greater	Noted. Section 4.2.8 of the report provides discussion on noise mitigation for the Project. Should noise mitigation be required as an outcome of the next phase of the operational noise assessment, noise barriers (1.5 metres above rail level) could be used to provide noise reductions similar to those given by rail dampers. It should be noted, however, that a noise barrier with an above rail height of 1.5 metres would appear at least 2 metres high (in its built form) due to the configuration of the track formation. However the height of the noise

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
				height.	barriers would vary between locations and this would be determined during the detailed design, if they are required. Noise mitigation measures adopted for the Project would be developed during the detailed design and in the consultation with affected landowners and DECC, and in accordance with the IGANRIP guidelines.
61	303	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Schofields Station should remain in its current location.	Noted. Section 3.2.2 of the report provides the justifications supporting the relocation of Schofields Station. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7).
61	304	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Another station should be built near Nirimba.	Noted. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 80) and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105).
61	305	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	The bus services in the area are inadequate and can't be relied upon as bus companies can change bus service routes and don't operate regularly during off-peak times and on weekends.	Refer to Section 3.2.1 of the report for discussion on future bus services between the existing and new Schofields stations. TIDC's response to submission no. 8 (ref. no. 29) demonstrates that the NSW Ministry of Transport (MoT) is tasked with improving performance across NSW bus networks including matching community needs with equitable and accessible transport. The MoT conducts yearly service reviews and works with partner agencies to implement key strategic initiatives aimed at improving bus service performance. As part of MoT's responsibilities, refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1) which discusses MoT's *Schofields Station Transition Plan*.
62	306	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	Weak arguments provided in the Environmental Assessment for the relocation of Schofields Station.	The justification for relocating Schofield Station is detailed in Section 3.2.2. Individual reasons are not to be viewed in isolation, rather based on a holistic, 'whole-of-government' approach.
62	307	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Why has the original proposal to construct an additional station at Nirimba been rejected in favour of relocating existing Schofields Station?	Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 80) and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
62	308	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Addition of a new Nirimba Station and retention of existing Schofields Station would benefit both existing Schofields residents, and future residents of the Alex Avenue precinct.	Noted. As provided above, please refer to TIDC's response to submission no 20 (ref. no. 80) and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105).
62	309	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Concerned about Bridge Street being used as a construction access road, as it will result in increased noise, traffic and would disturb Bridge Street residents.	The increases in traffic volume on Bridge Street during operation have already been detailed in TIDC's response to submission no. 55 (ref. no. 256). It is assumed therefore that this impact during operation will be similar to that of light construction vehicles accessing Bridge Street during construction. Section 3.2.3 provides the construction and operational impacts associated with the Project. Management measures to mitigate construction noise have been detailed in this section.
62	310	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Expect that the original construction access route through a new track extending west to Vernon Road would be honoured.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 25 (ref. no. 116) and no. 30 (ref. no. 127).
62	311	Noise and vibration	Noise mitigation	At Bridge Street, train noise travels a long distance as the railway is raised above all houses on the western side of the corridor. As such, requests that a proper noise barrier is built, protecting all houses on the western side.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 40 (ref. no. 196).
62	312	Project design	Pedestrian and cyclist facilities	The footpath on Bridge Street should be extended to the stairs of the new Schofields Station.	Noted. Pedestrian access is proposed to be provided along the extension of Bridge Street to the new station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
62	313	Project design	Car parking provisions	The eastern side car park is too small to cater for large numbers of commuters. It is only slightly bigger than the western side car park, despite the fact that the vast majority of commuters will arrive at the eastern side.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no 57 (ref. no. 286). This response notes that it is not recommended that the future demand for car parking at stations be matched through the construction of large parking structures near each station. Rather, the demand could be met by providing parking along the rail line as a whole. As the Strategies and Land Release Branch plans progress, further parking considerations will be undertaken in conjunction with MoT, RailCorp, BCC and other agencies as deemed relevant.
62	314	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	The consultation period was too short to review the Environmental Assessment. Requests an extension to the consultation period.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 21 (ref. no. 97).
63	315	Other	Other	Use original Burdekin level crossing at Railway Terrace.	The Burdekin Road level crossing has been decommissioned and is not designed as a public traffic accessible site, rather it is a maintenance access point. If it was used for construction, it would increase workforce and commuter risk profiles from a safety perspective. Additionally, this level crossing has been decommissioned in line with government policy for the closure of level crossings.
64	316	Non-Indigenous heritage	Riverstone Station	Pleased about the recognition of the historical importance of the Riverstone Station and associated buildings.	Noted.
64	317	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	Appreciate the availability of staff to answer questions and information at community information sessions.	Noted.
64	318	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	Requests that future printed information is made available at Riverstone Library.	Noted – Chapter 2 of this report documents the various public exhibition displays and locations where the Environmental Assessment was provided for public review and comment.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
64	319	Project design	Footbridge design	Doesn't understand why the pedestrian footbridge at Riverstone Station is going to the design Stage when the rest of the planning around Garfield overpass and the Potential Riverstone West development has not yet been finalised.	The Environmental Assessment was based on concept design. The concept design stage and consultation is currently ongoing with Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA providing input on the location of footbridge. Once Stage 2 is commenced, detailed design would be progressed in consultation with the RTA and the Strategies and Land Release Branch. The design can be revisited as plans become more detailed for Stage 2 of the Project.
64	320	Traffic and transport	Future road network	Will be lobbying the RTA to leave Garfield Road open with a vehicle weight restriction to exclude trucks. The outcome of this would be that the existing pedestrian arrangements at Garfield Road could remain in place.	Noted. Further treatment of Garfield Road is dependant on the RTA and the consultation and assessment that would be conducted by this agency is, separate to this Project.
64	321	Traffic and transport	Future road network	If the RTA builds an overpass and closes Garfield Road, RailCorp should expand the existing pedestrian rail crossing to allow more people to cross at the one time and avoid the need and subsequent cost of a footbridge.	Noted. As discussed in Section 6.2.6 of the EA and 4.2.11 of this report, the RTA proposes to replace the vehicle level crossing at Garfield Road, which is anticipated to be completed prior to an increase in rail services. The Project would improve public safety by removing the at-grade pedestrian level crossings at Quakers Hill, Schofields and Riverstone, and replacing these with footbridges. With respect to the Garfield Road level crossing, a grade separated crossing of the rail line would be needed to achieve the optimal benefit from Stage 2 of the Project. The construction of Stage 2 would be coordinated with RailCorp, RTA, TIDC and the Strategies and Land Release Branch. If the Riverstone Railway Overpass is not competed prior to the proposed increase in train services, then the level of service of the Garfield Road level crossing is expected to degrade. SoC no. 23 states '*The proponent would develop a contingency plan in conjunction with the RTA and the Strategies and Land Release Branch on the delivery of alternative access across the rail line in the event that the Garfield Road level crossing is not replaced prior to commissioning of Stage 2'.*

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
64	322	Traffic and transport	Future road network	Does not understand why the existing Riverstone Railway Pedestrian Crossing can't remain in use. This would preserve the amenity of the historical precinct.	As stated earlier in TIDC's response to submission no. 64 (ref. no. 320 and no. 321) and submission no. 63 (ref. no. 315), the RTA and RailCorp prefers to close the existing level crossings as a vehicle, train and pedestrian safety issue.
64	323	Consultation	Further consultation	Would like to see further detailed information supplied about the proposed Riverstone footbridge, including the construction of a scale model.	TIDC will consult with other government agencies including the NSW Heritage Branch, Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA. More detailed information on the footbridge will be produced during detailed design.
64	324	Project design	Footbridge design	Concerned about the visible amenity of the Riverstone footbridge. The information supplied in the non-Indigenous heritage assessment is useless in providing an indication of how the footbridge will impact on the area.	Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 64 (ref. no. 324).
64	325	Project design	Footbridge design	Questions whether the Riverstone footbridge needs to be so large. It appears that the footbridge is too large to be located so close to items of State Historical Significance.	The proposed height of the footbridge needs to accommodate overhead train lines. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 64 (ref. no. 324).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
64	326	Project design	Footbridge design	If the Riverstone footbridge is to be constructed, it should be designed and constructed of materials to be as small and invisible as possible.	Noted.
64	327	Non-Indigenous heritage	Riverstone Station	The Project provides no obvious benefit to the future use of the Station masters cottage at Riverstone Station. Without a backyard, the future uses of the building are restricted. Would like work go into reviewing a potential link between the proposed forecourt and the potential uses for the cottage.	Noted. The future use of the Stations master's cottage is to be investigated with Strategies and Land Release Branch and RailCorp in precinct planning for the area. These investigations may be ongoing in the future and will be further detailed for Stage 2 of the Project.
64	328	Project design	Footbridge design	Would like to see an option that continues the existing pedestrian crossing and negates the need to build the footbridge at all.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's responses to submission no. 64 (ref. no. 319 to 321). The level crossing at Garfield Road is to be closed by the RTA as a separate process to the Project. Footbridges are proposed to offer a safer arrangement for pedestrians to cross the rail corridor.
64	329	Non-Indigenous heritage	Culverts	Two culverts along the line are of historical significance and should be maintained. The first is south of existing Schofields Station, near the intersection of Advance Street. The Second is between Riverstone and Schofields Stations, near the intersection of Robinson Street.	The culvert south of existing Schofields Station, near the intersection of Advance Street, will require augmentation during Stage 2 of the Project. This would require upgrade (elongation) of the existing culvert from its existing location towards Railway Parade to cater for the new track. The ability to retain the fabric on the culvert is limited, however it would be considered during the detailed design of the Stage 2. It should be noted however that the culverts associated with the Quakers Hill to Vineyard section of the Richmond Branch Line were identified to have a moderate local heritage significance in the non-Indigenous heritage Assessment that was undertaken for the Environmental Assessment (refer technical Paper 3 in Volume 2 of the EA).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
				Both are built of and are rare examples along the Richmond Line of craftsmanship displayed in early railway construction. It would be possible to retain these culverts.	
64	330	Project design	Upgrade of Riverstone Station	Investigation should be undertaken into the materials used for the tactiles used at Riverstone Station. Rubber and metal tactiles are a hazard themselves when wet as they become extremely slippery.	Noted. The Riverstone Station upgrade would be designed and constructed in accordance with RailCorp's *Station Design Standard Requirements* (July 2008). These Standards are subservient to: ▪ State and Commonwealth legislation and ▪ Any Regulations, Codes or Standards required to be followed by them for any building, part of a building, structure or related land or infrastructure. As such, equal access standards under the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* and *AS 1428 Design for access and mobility* are incorporated into RailCorp's station design. TIDC will review construction materials being used for the Project during the detailed design. Any tactiles that are used must comply with the Australian Standard for slip coefficient.
64	331	Project design	Upgrade of Riverstone Station	The Project does not appear to address the need for increased parking in the vicinity of Riverstone Station.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 29 (ref. no. 126).
64	332	Project design	Upgrade of Riverstone Station	There does not appear to be any provision for a bus interchange other than what is already on existence. Respondent hopes that the War Memorial/Station precinct would not be impacted by the provision of a bus interchange.	There will be no impact proposed to the war memorial/station precinct at Riverstone.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
64	333	Project design	Upgrade of Riverstone Station	Will there be provision for expanded secure bicycle storage at Riverstone Station. There does not appear to be much space on the eastern side of the station complex, however some could be made on the western side behind platform 2.	Bike parking facilities are provided at Riverstone Station currently, near the commuter car park, with eight lockers provided for cyclists. The Project will provide concrete padmounts as allocated space for bike lockers to be provided by MoT on a demand basis upon completion of Stage 2. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 15 (ref. no. 53) regarding the cycleway network to be developed as part of the NWGC.
65	334	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Object to the proposal, especially the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted.
65	335	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The existing Schofields Station is located within a walkable distance for current residents and is not at risk of falling apart.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7), no. 5 (ref. no. 13), no. 10 (ref. no. 34) and no. 23 (ref. no. 104, 105 and 113).
65	336	Other	Other	The Project is a waste of money.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 11) and no. 16 (ref. no. 58).
66	337	Project design	Impact on future land use	The duplicated track corridor, Vineyard Station and its accompanying car park significantly encroaches on land currently held by North West Transport Hub. This is concerning as this area is being considered by the NSW Government for a possible light industrial precinct.	Noted. The NSW Government is aware of this proposal and have been working and consulting with Strategies and Land Release Branch throughout development of Project and precinct plan. It should be noted that the Strategies and Land Release Branch's draft indicative layout plan for the Riverstone precinct does not propose to locate light industrial land in the vicinity of the Vineyard Station car park.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
66	338	Consultation	Further consultation	Requests more detailed plan of the potential project footprint so it can be determined whether there is any loss of land or complicated compensation issue arising from the Project.	Noted. TIDC will consult will all potentially affected land owners during the development of the detailed project design. Compensation for land acquired will be in accordance with the NSW *Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991*. Precinct Plans (Alex Avenue, Riverstone and Riverstone West Precinct Plan Reports) completed by Strategies and Land Release Branch were developed in consultation with RailCorp and TIDC.
66	339	Project design	Impact on future land use	Seeks to ensure that TIDC are aware of North West Transport Hub's plan for the site before any further planning work is undertaken on the Project.	Noted. TIDC has consulted with Strategies and Land Release Branch, RTA and RailCorp in the preparation of Project plans and concept design related to the proposed rail duplication.
66	340	Consultation	Further consultation	Requests a briefing with TIDC to obtain a full understanding of the scope of this Project.	Noted.
66	341	Project design	Impact on future land use	An indicative layout plan of North West Transport Hub's land at Riverstone West has been attached for TIDC's consideration.	Noted.
67	342	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Objects to Bridge Street being used as a construction access road.	Noted. Refer to Section 3.2.3 of the report and TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 6) and submission no. 62 (ref. no. 309) for a discussion on the likely traffic impacts to Bridge Street.
67	343	Traffic and transport	Bridge Street	Objects to Bridge Street being used as an access road to the new Schofields Station commuter car park.	Noted. Refer to Section 3.2.3 of the report. Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 6) and submission no. 62 (ref. no. 309) for a discussion on the likely traffic impacts to Bridge Street.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
67	344	Other	Council advice on development	When planning the construction of a new shed and house on a property along Bridge Street approximately two years ago, Blacktown City Council advised that there were no proposals within the vicinity of their property.	TIDC can not comment on the advice or information provided to this resident by Blacktown City Council concerning property development. In 2004 by the NSW Government confirming two major growth centres - the North West and South West Growth Centres. At this time, the Growth Centres Commission (now the Strategies and Land Release Branch) was established to ensure that services were planned, funded and linked to the sequence of land release within the Growth Centres. The NSW Government's Rail Clearways Program (to which this Project is a part of) was announced in 2004 and declared a major project under Part 3A of the EP&A Act 1979 in 2005. In 2006, plans for the track duplication, as part of NWGC precinct planning, were developed and assessed. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 16 (ref. no. 58) for further detail on the development of this Project in consultation with Strategies and Land Release Branch's plans.
67	345	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Have started renovating/building their house on the presumption that there would not be any development near their property.	Noted. Please refer to TIDC's response to 67 (ref. no. 344).
67	346	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Some Bridge Street residents own trucks which will have difficulty exiting their properties with construction vehicles driving up and down the street.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 3 (ref. no. 6) for a discussion on the likely traffic impacts to Bridge Street.
67	347	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Project staff have been parking out the front of Bridge Street properties which has made it difficult for truck drivers to get their vehicles in/out of their properties. This impact will be worse when construction starts.	Once the construction compound is erected at the start of construction for Stage 1, there will be parking for construction workers within the compound area, hence it is anticipated there will not be any need for construction workers to be parking construction or private vehicles on Bridge Street. Impacts to Bridge Street as a result of the construction phase are discussed in Section 3.2.3 of the report and have been detailed in TIDC's response to submission no. 62 (ref. no. 309).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
67	348	Noise and vibration	Construction traffic	Bridge Street is a quiet local street that will be impacted by increased noise from construction traffic.	Section 3.2.3 of this report provides a response related to the construction impacts on Bridge Street resulting from the Project.
67	349	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Construction traffic could damage Bridge Street residents' vehicles. If this occurred who would pay for this?	Refer to Section 3.2.3 of the report for discussion related to impacts to Bridge Street during construction. As referred to in submission 67 (ref. no. 347) and submission no. 67 (ref. no. 348), light vehicles during construction works would utilise Bridge Street to access the construction compound. The risk to damaging cars along Bridge Street would therefore not increase significantly from the general risks to resident's cars that exist currently. Heavy and large construction vehicles would use the alternative route along Vernon Road and new construction access track where possible.
67	350	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Construction vehicles would damage the road pavement on Bridge Street.	Refer to Section 3.2.3 of the report for discussion related to impacts to Bridge Street during construction. Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 67 (ref 349) and submission no. 55 (ref. no. 261).
67	351	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	If Bridge Street is used as a construction access road it will be difficult for vehicles to pass each other.	Refer to Section 3.2.3 of the report for discussion related to impacts to Bridge Street during construction. As referred to in submission 67 (ref. no. 347) and submission no. 67 (ref. no. 348), light vehicles during construction works would predominately utilise Bridge Street to access the construction compound. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 9 (ref. no. 32) for details on impacts to Bridge Street during construction.
67	352	Public safety	Construction	The RLA construction compound sheds are located very close to their Bridge Street property, which will make it unsafe for their children to play in their front yard.	Public safety is an issue of paramount importance. During construction, existing traffic conditions along Bridge Street will be adhered to by all construction workers during the construction period. It is anticipated the issue of safety along Bridge Street will be discussed in site inductions to ensure workers are familiar with these existing conditions. There will also be perimeter gates to provide access into the constriction compound at the end of Bridge Street. These gates will prevent members of the public access the construction compound and associated construction work along the rail corridor.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
67	353	Noise and vibration	Construction	Standard of living will be reduced during construction as a result of increased noise from the RLA construction compound which is located close to their property.	Refer to Sections 3.2.3 and 4.1.2 of the report for discussion on noise impacts during construction of the Project. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission 67 (ref. no. 348) for impacts and proposed mitigation measures.
67	354	Traffic and transport	Construction traffic	Vernon Road would be more suitable as a construction access route as there are less residential properties along this street.	Noted. This has been referred to in earlier responses. Refer to TIDC response to submission no. 9 (ref. no. 32) as an example. Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the report for discussion on construction access routes.
67	355	Other	Future land development	Why can't land close to existing Schofields Station be rezoned to accommodate higher density development?	The EA discusses flooding impacts limiting development potential in Section 8.1 and 8.7. This is not part of the project and relates to Council and Strategies and Land Release Branch matters.
67	356	Noise and vibration	Rail noise	The temporary track turnout is located close to their property which will result in an increase in train noise.	The impact of the temporary track turnout was assessed in the noise and vibration assessment that was undertaken for the Project. As described in Section 8.4.5 of the Environmental Assessment: ▪ The after opening $L_{Aeq(15hour)}$ noise levels are predicted to comply with the trigger levels of $L_{Aeq(15\ hour)}$ 65 dBA and $L_{Aeq(9\ hour)}$ 60 dBA at all receivers located immediately adjacent to the proposed turnout. A localised increase of up to 3 dBA in the $L_{Aeq(15hour)}$ and $L_{Aeq(9\ hour)}$ noise levels is predicted at the nearest receiver locations. ▪ The after opening L_{Amax} noise levels are predicted to comply with the trigger level of 85 dBA at all receivers located immediately adjacent to the proposed turnout. A localised increase of up to 3 dBA in the L_{Amax} noise levels is predicted at the nearest receiver locations. Therefore, noise levels at the nearest potentially affected receivers are predicted to comply with the overall IGANRIP noise trigger levels for the after opening situation in 2013. Further consideration of noise mitigation measures is not required for the after opening (Year 2013) scenario at receiver locations adjacent to the temporary turnout.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					However, post construction noise monitoring will be done to assess the accuracy of the predications of the noise model during operation.
67	357	Socio-economic	Privacy	Trains stopping at the temporary track turnout will result in an invasion of privacy for Bridge Street residents as train commuters will be able to look into residents' properties.	It is not anticipated that the temporary turnout (intersection and mechanism for the meeting of two tracks) would cause trains to be idle for long periods of time and therefore causing an 'invasion of privacy for residents'. It is more likely that the train would be travelling at a reduced speed as it approaches the turnout. The rail corridor is an existing corridor where residents would already have exposure to this corridor currently from passing trains on the Richmond Branch Line.
67	358	Noise and vibration	Noise mitigation	Would prefer a large wall or barrier to be constructed behind Bridge Street properties to reduce noise and privacy impacts to Bridge Street residents.	Noted. The EA in Technical Paper 2 (Noise) identified Manorhouse Boulevard, Quakers Hill Preschool, Tain Place and Bridge St as locations to be considered for noise mitigation. Should noise mitigation be required as an outcome of the next phase of the operational noise assessment, if deemed as a reasonable and feasible noise mitigation measure in consultation with affected residents, noise barriers will be installed. Currently, noise modelling predicts that noise barriers (1.5 metres above rail level) could be used to provide noise reductions similar to those given by rail dampers. It should be noted, however, that a noise barrier with an above rail height of 1.5 metres would appear at least 2 metres high (in its built form) due to the configuration of the track formation. At Bridge St and Tain Place, the resultant noise barrier height would be in the order of 3 metres (when measured from the bottom of the existing embankment). Noise modelling with a noise barrier height of approximately 1.5 metres above rail at each exceedance location predicts that project's target levels (65 dBA $L_{Aeq(15\ hour)}$ target noise and LAmax noise levels would be achieved at Bridge Street and Tain Place. While offering similar noise mitigation to that given by rail dampers, barriers would have a visual impact, which may provide some privacy screening however noise barriers would also require ongoing maintenance issues related to graffiti. Further investigation, progression of detailed design and consultation with residents and DECC will determine the optimal noise treatments based on the IGANRIP guidelines, detailed design and consultation.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
67	359	Public safety	Bridge Street	Graffiti vandals will be attracted to Bridge Street if it becomes an access road to the new Schofields Station. There will also be an increased risk of theft.	Design of the new station has incorporated Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles including consideration of graffiti. Additional lighting and other design treatments which may help to reduce potential for theft and graffiti will be determined and considered further through the detailed design phase.
67	360	Consultation	Further consultation	Requests to be informed about the outcome of this submission.	Noted.
68	361	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Objects to the proposal, in particular the relocation of Schofields Station south of its current location.	Noted.
68	362	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Relocating Schofields Station will remove the heart of the suburb and will force many residents to stop walking to the station and start using private vehicles to access it. Does the proposed car parking allocation allow for this increase in demand for car parking spaces?	The 2031 access to station mode shares were developed through a rigorous analysis as described in Section 4.1 of the Transport Technical Paper. The car mode share of 55% for Vineyard and 48% for Riverstone and Schofields considers the following: ▪ It was assumed that significantly improved bus services would be provided as the surrounding residential areas are developed (currently being reviewed by MoT). These services would support the proposed development of improved bus interchange facilities at each of the stations. Bus mode share was assumed to increase to 22% (1999 average of outer Sydney suburban stations, Transport and Population Data Centre 1999). ▪ The mode share assumptions already exist at Sydney stations that are considered equivalent in population and density to the proposed 2031 situation surrounding the Richmond rail line. ▪ The 1999 average car mode share for outer Sydney suburban stations (Transport and Population Data Centre 1999) is 41%. If the bus services are not improved then the proposed bus mode share is unlikely to be achieved, and this will be replaced by an increase in car mode share. However this is not the assumption that was made. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. no. 16 (ref. no. 59), no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 3 (ref. no. 5) and no. 5 (ref. no. 14).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
68	363	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Elderly residents and families will be unable to walk to the new Station, and will result in increased demand for buses or private vehicle use.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 4 (ref. no. 9) and no 5 (ref. no. 14).
68	364	Socio-economic	Property values	Moving Schofields Station will devalue land value for property located close to the existing station.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission 20 (ref. no. 90). Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 107).
68	365	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Residents bought their properties because they were within walking distance of the current Schofields train station.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. This section of the report also addresses the socio-economic impacts to residents and details issues related to accessibility. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 13, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).
68	366	Project design	Shared user path	It is unclear how the area between the existing and new Schofields Stations will provide safe pedestrian and bicycle access – there is currently no footpath, and security lighting would be needed which will impact residents with properties along the route.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 15).
68	367	Socio-economic	Business viability	Local businesses within Schofields village centre rely on patrons from Schofields Station. Relocating the station will result in these shops closing down and becoming a graffiti target.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
68	368	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Why does the proposed new Schofields Station need to be so far south of the current station? There is available land closer to Schofields Road which could accommodate the station.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 13). The location of the relocated Schofield Station was selected given its alignment with the Alex Avenue Precinct plan. The location accommodates operational and constructability factors and offers better orientation with the road network, such as Pelican Road and Burdekin Road. The location also offers better sightlines for access to and from interchange and car park, better cut and fill balance and minimal impacts to Sydney water services.
68	369	Project design	Station design, visual treatments and landscaping	Graffiti is a big issue for the Schofields area. Concrete structures will be a target for graffiti and would become an eyesore.	Options for graffiti protection treatment would be provided where necessary for the Project. Refer to submission no. 67 (ref. no. 359) with regard to new station design and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles which have considered graffiti.
68	370	Project design	New Schofields Station	Why is there no provision for a kiss-and-ride facility on the western side of the new Schofields Station?	There is provision for kiss-and-ride facility on the western side of the new Schofields Station.
68	371	Non-Indigenous heritage	Existing Schofields Station	There is a historic value held by Schofields residents as to there being a station at Schofields, with the link to the historic John Schofield, which is not significantly acknowledged by the Environmental Assessment.	The Environmental Assessment determined in Section 8.5 and Technical Paper 3 of the EA, there are no listed heritage items at Schofields Station and the Station itself is not heritage listed. During the preparation of the Environmental Assessment, further investigation of the history behind Schofields Station was undertaken in response to concerns raised by community stakeholders. The following findings were made by the subsequent heritage assessment undertaken for the Project: ▪ The Schofields Station siding was initially located further south of the current Schofields Station. The station has since been relocated to its current location on land sold to the Commissioner of Railways by John Schofield in 1881. Based on the results of platform excavations at other sites in NSW, it is not expected that any remnants of the original platform remain. The current station complex at Schofields, comprising the station building, platform and an ancillary building fronting Railway Parade, is a relatively recent construction and contains no significant heritage components. Schofields

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
					Station initially consisted of a short brick platform that was the length of one train carriage and was constructed on one side of the track, while a siding was constructed on the other side. The siding remained in use until it became inadequate for the needs of the community and the platform was lengthened in 1939.
68	372	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Clarification about what will happen to the current carpark area at existing Schofields Station once the station is removed.	As described in Section 5.1.1, the Schofields pedestrian footbridge is proposed to be relocated at the site of the existing Schofields Station (as opposed to north of the station as proposed in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Assessment). Refer to Section 5.1.1 for further discussion on this proposed modification to the project design. ▪ The current car park will be removed and rehabilitated with plans to be developed in detail consultation with RailCorp in the Urban design and landscape plan. This is discussed in Section 5.1.1 of the report.
68	373	Traffic and transport	Operational traffic impacts	The Project will result in increased traffic on Westminster Street Bridge which is not proposed to be upgraded until Stage 2 of the Project. The upgrade to Westminster Street Bridge should occur as part of the Stage 1 works.	As parking will be provided on both the eastern and western sides of new Schofields Station, it is not expected that the project would significantly increase traffic volumes on Westminster Street Bridge. As discussed in TIDC's response to submission no. 31 (ref. no. 136), Westminster Street Bridge is not required to be reconstructed or upgraded during Stage 1 as the duplication of the track under the bridge would not take place until Stage 2 of the Project. TIDC will continue to work with the Strategies and Land Release Branch as to the future of this bridge during development of Stage 2 detailed design. Refer to the response to reference no. 54 Table D (Government Table, Appendix D) regarding the Westminster Street Bridge.
68	374	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	Why wasn't a copy of the Environmental Assessment made available at Riverstone library, as opposed to Blacktown and Windsor Libraries which are outside the Project area and considerably harder for local residents to access?	Chapter 2 of this report provides the location of each of the seven exhibition locations which were approved by the Department of Planning. All of the community sessions had a copy and a community information session was conducted at Riverstone on the 27 May 2009. Copies of the EA were also available on request and could be accessed via TIDC's and Department of Planning's website.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
69	375	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Objects to the current proposal, particularly to the moving of Schofields Station.	Noted.
69	376	Socio-economic	Business viability	Relocating Schofields Station will impact on business owners and the vast majority of existing residents.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 13, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).
69	377	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Why is Schofields Station being relocated when the suburb's current infrastructure is located around the Station?	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 13), and no. 23 (ref. no. 104 and 105).
69	378	Socio-economic	Equality	Property developers in the future housing areas towards Alex Avenue would be the only benefactors if Schofields Station were to be relocated.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 12).
69	379	Socio-economic	Business viability	Relocation of Schofields Station would result in some, if not all, the existing businesses to close at some point due to loss of trade.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8).
69	380	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Relocating Schofields Station would result in most residents having to walk further and would likely result in more residents driving to the station.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 14).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
69	381	Socio-economic	Property values	Relocation of Schofields Station would negatively affect property prices.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission 20, ref no. 90. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 16 (ref. no. 39) and no. 23 (ref. no. 107).
69	382	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Schofields is the only country town next to a train line that remains in Sydney, and relocating the station would change the character of the area.	Noted. Earlier TIDC responses (such as submission 4, ref 7) provide the justification for the relocation Schofields Station. The Schofields area is part of the NWGC which will see significant changes to the character of this area in the future as the Alex Ave, Riverstone and Riverstone West precincts (previously released between December 2008 and March 2009 for public comment) are developed. Details on these precinct plans are available via the Department of Planning's Strategies and Land Release Branch, formerly GCC.
69	383	Support for the project	–	Not opposed to the duplication of the existing track.	Noted.
69	384	Consultation	Project design	Schofields residents have not been considered in the current plan.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 16).
69	385	Consultation	Project design	Project design to be revised to consider feedback from existing Schofields residents.	This process of submissions report is one an opportunity for the design to be reconsidered. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 16) and chapter 2 of this report to obtain information on the consultation that has occurred to date and future consultation activities to occur. Figure 1-2 of this report also provides the approval process, noting that a Preferred Project Report is required when design changes are proposed which alter the Project.
70	386	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Object to the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
70	387	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Elderly residents will be unable to walk the additional distance to access the relocated Schofields Station. Bus services are not an alternative as they are almost non-existent in the area in off-peak times.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1) and no. 4 (ref. no. 9).
70	388	Socio-economic	Business viability	Relocation of Schofields Station will impact on business viability.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8).
70	389	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The majority of housing around Schofields is located in close proximity to the current station location, and relocating it would greatly inconvenience the majority of Schofields residents.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 3 (ref. no. 5), no. 4 (ref. no. 9) and no. 5 (ref. no. 13 and 14).
71	390	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Object to the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted.
71	391	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Bought property as it was located close to the train station.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Sub-issue 1 discusses accessibility impacts, and sub-issue 3 provides a discussion on the socio-economic impacts affecting residents. Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 3, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).
71	392	Socio-economic	Property values	Relocation of Schofields Station will affect the life of the area and property value.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 16 (ref. no. 59) and no. 23 (ref. no. 107).
72	393	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Object to the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
72	394	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Would not be within walking distance of the station if Schofields Station was relocated.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9).
72	395	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Residents bought their properties to be located close to the station.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 3, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).
72	396	Socio-economic	Business viability	Relocation of Schofields Station will impact on business viability, because they depend on the passing trade.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8).
73	397	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Objects to the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted.
73	398	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Bought property as it was located close to the train station and local shopping centre.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 of the report addresses the impacts associated with relocating Schofields Station. Sub-issue 1 discusses accessibility impacts, and sub-issue 3 provides a discussion on the socio-economic impacts affecting residents. Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 3, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).
73	399	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Would have to drive to the station if it is relocated, which would incur unnecessary personal costs to maintain and operate a vehicle. This would also have an impact on the environment.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9) and no. 5 (ref. no. 14).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
73	400	Socio-economic	Business viability	Removing existing Schofields Station will result in loss of businesses from the local shopping centre, which would result in the shopping centre closing.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8).
73	401	Socio-economic	Business viability	The closure of existing Schofields Station will impact on business viability and loss of livelihood for business owners.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8).
73	402	Socio-economic	Property values	The relocation of Schofields Station will devalue property located close to the existing station.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 (refer to sub-issue 3) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission 20 (ref no. 90). Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 107).
74	403	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Supports the duplication of the rail line and the provision of the new Nirimba Station, however requests that the existing Schofields Station be upgraded to include a second platform and left in its current location.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7), no. 5 (ref. no. 13), no. 10 (ref. no. 34) and no. 23 (ref. no. 104, 105 and 113).
74	404	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The existing Schofields Station could remain and would only need a pedestrian level crossing to provide enough access.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 5 (ref. no. 13) and no. 10 (ref. no. 34).
74	405	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The existing Schofields Station does not cost much to run and express trains would not need to stop at it.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 10 (ref. no. 34).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
74	406	Other	Other rail projects	The new Nirimba Station could be set up so a north west rail line could connect to the Richmond line in the future.	This is outside the proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project.
74	407	Socio-economic	Business viability	Existing Schofields Station is required to support nearby shops and residents.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8).
75	408	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Objects to the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted.
75	409	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	Bought property as it was located close to the train station and local shopping centre.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7, 8 and 9), no. 5 (ref. no. 3, 15 and 16) and no. 3 (ref. no. 5).
75	410	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Will be an inconvenience to have to walk 500 metres to the railway station.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9).
75	411	Socio-economic	Property values	Relocation of Schofields Station will devalue property values.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission 20 (ref. no. 90). Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 107).
75	412	Socio-economic	Business viability	Relocation of Schofields Station will impact on business viability of the local shops.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 8).
76	413	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Objects to the Project, particularly the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
76	414	Socio-economic	Property values	Property is currently a 5 minute walk from the station. Relocating the station will be a disadvantage as it will devalue the value of the property.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) discusses the impact on residents and property prices, as reflected in TIDC's response to submission 20 (ref. no. 90). Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 107).
76	415	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Elderly residents will have to walk further if the Station is relocated.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 9).
77	416	Supports the Project	–	Strongly support the Richmond Line Duplication (Quakers Hill to Vineyard) Project as it will provide fast and effective link between Richmond and Sydney CBD, and hopefully will ease the pressure on the CityRail network.	Noted.
77	417	Project Design	Station facilities, car parks and interchanges	More commuter car parking should be provided on the western side of Riverstone Railway Station near Richmond Avenue. Commuter parking should also be provided on the eastern side of the Station.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 29 (ref. no. 126).
77	418	Project Design	Station facilities, car parks and interchanges	Pick-up and drop-off zones should be provided on both sides of the Riverstone Railway Station for smooth traffic flow to cope with the future need.	Refer to Sections 3.2.5 and 3.3.5 of the report for discussion on car parking, taxi and kiss-and-ride facilities at Riverstone Station.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
77	419	Project Design	Station facilities, car parks and interchanges	A taxi rank should be provided at Riverstone Station.	Refer to Sections 3.2.5 and 3.3.5 of the report for discussion on car parking, taxi and kiss-and-ride facilities at Riverstone Station.
78	420	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	None of the local papers that the exhibition notification was advertised in are available in areas outside of the Project area.	TIDC advertised the Project in a selected number of local newspapers, based on their distribution within communities likely to be directly affected by the Project (both adverse and beneficial impacts). Advertisements were also placed in the Daily Telegraph and Sydney Morning Herald, which were more widely available to communities located outside of the Project area. There were also notifications placed on both TIDC's and Department of Planning's websites. Further details of the consultation activities that TIDC undertook during the exhibition of the Environmental Assessment are described in Chapter 2 and in response no. 21 in Table D (Government Agency Table) in Appendix D.
78	421	Supports the Project	–	Supports the Project.	Noted.
78	422	Other	Western road access to Vineyard Station.	There is no road access that links Richmond Road to Vineyard Station near Berkshire Park and Windsor Downs.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 21 (ref. no. 98).
78	423	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	Could TIDC organise a letterbox drop for Berkshire Park, Llandilo and Shanes Park, as these commuters are also affected by the Project.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 21 (ref. no. 94).
79	424	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Opposes the relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
79	425	Project design	Consideration of additional Stations	Supports the retention of existing Schofields Station along with the development of Nirimba Station at the intersection of Burdekin Road and Railway Terrace.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7), no. 5 (ref. no. 13 and 17), no. 10 (ref. no. 34), no. 14 (ref. no. 48), no. 20 (ref. no. 80), no. 23 (ref. no. 105) and no. 28 (ref. no. 124).
79	426	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Schofields residents will need to walk further to access the new station, or Drive, or wait for a connecting bus service.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 4 (ref. no. 9) and no. 5 (ref. no. 14).
79	427	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Notwithstanding the MoT's review of the bus services for the region, it is expected that travel times to the new Schofields Station will be longer and less convenient than the existing situation.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 3 (ref. no. 5) and no. 4 (ref. no. 9).
79	428	Project design	Development of preferred project option	Option A did not consider upgrading existing Schofields Station by building a second platform at Schofields Station, despite the Metropolitan Strategy identifying the construction of an additional station (i.e. the creation of two stations, rather than one).	It was an assumption of Option A that Schofields Station would require an upgrade in order to accommodate the line duplication as the existing station would not be able to service the two sets of track. Although the Environmental Assessment outlines a number of station location options (A, B and C) for Schofields which were considered in developing the project, the proposal put forward for assessment is Option C (relocation of Schofields Station approximately 800 metres south of existing station) as the preferred option. The justification for this decision was based on several factors which have been summarised in TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
79	429	Project design	Development of preferred project option	Option B proposed to build the new Nirimba Station close to existing Schofields Station, which strengthens the justification for not proceeding with Option B. Option B was presented in such a way that would be easily rejected as the preferred option.	The location of Nirimba, as presented in Option B, was taken from the proposed location outlined in the NSW Governments' Metropolitan Strategy. Refer to Section 3.2.2 of the report for further information on the option selection process and the Environmental Assessment's assessment of the Preferred Option to relocate Schofields Station. TIDC responses to the following submissions may also provide further information on the option selection process and the Environmental Assessment's assessment of the Preferred Option to relocate Schofields Station: Submission no. 4 (ref. no. 7), no. 5 (ref. no. 13), no. 10 (ref. no. 34), no. 23 (ref. no. 104, 105 and 113) and submission no. 79 (ref. no. 431).
79	430	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	Existing Schofields Station only requires an additional platform to accommodate the track duplication works.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 10 (ref. no. 34).
79	431	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The Metropolitan Strategy identified existing Schofields Station as a local interchange, while the proposed Nirimba Station was to function as the major specialised multi-access interchange. The Metropolitan Strategy identifies that the existing small station based town centre be intensified.	Refer to Section 3.2.2 of the report for discussion on the development of the preferred project option.
79	432	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	The Metropolitan Strategy acknowledged Schofields as a Station-based village.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no 79 (ref. no. 431).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
79	433	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	The justification that the location of Nirimba Station would potentially not be able to have the required level of high density housing is unsubstantiated.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no 79 (ref. no. 431).
79	434	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	Can TIDC provide a copy of their policy (or guidelines) on how station locations are determined? It is acknowledged that such a document does not exist. Of the 121 stations on the network, 50 are 1 kilometre or less apart.	Determining the location of rail stations is based on fundamental planning principles that consider the individual circumstances of the area in question. The determination is based on a range of factors considered together, including land use planning issues incorporating future development and existing development, rail operational requirements, transport planning across the region and interaction with other transport services, the topographical and geographical constraints of the sites, constructability, and other matters as appropriate to the circumstances.
79	435	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	The Metropolitan Strategy acknowledged improved running times with the delivery of the Nirimba Station and duplication to the existing Schofields Station.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 79 (ref. no. 432).
79	436	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	TIDC were unable to provide clarification on how frequently trains overshot existing Schofields Station. At the community information session, TIDC dismissed this justification on the basis that the existing Schofields Station is on level ground and that overshooting was due to	Noted. Please refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 79 (ref. no. 436).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
				driver error or the maintenance of rolling stock.	
79	437	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	The existing Schofields and Nirimba stations are not located within the 1 in 100 year flood zone, however Riverstone Station is. Therefore relocating Schofield Station due to flooding is not a valid reason.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 20 (ref. no. 83) for discussion on flooding issues relating to existing Schofields Station. Riverstone Station is not proposed to be relocated as it is has been identified by the Strategies and Land Release Branch as a key feature to the transport network for the Riverstone and Riverstone West precincts. Additionally, there are different planning objectives for Riverstone and Schofields precincts. Riverstone Precinct is planned for over 24,000 new residents. Alex Avenue precinct is planned for around 17,000 new residents and Schofields Precinct is planned for approximately 14,000 new residents. The North West Structure Plan identifies parts of the Riverstone West Precinct as suitable for industrial/employment land development and demonstrates different constraints when comparing to residential land use as part of precinct planning.
79	438	Project Justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	The justification for selection the new Schofields Station as the preferred option based on it being able to be constructed outside "live rail" tracks is surprising, given that the majority of work conducted on the Sydney network is within the "live rail" tracks.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 57 (ref. no. 289).
79	439	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	The relocation of Schofields Station would be for the benefit of Alex Avenue residents, and not for existing Schofields residents.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 4 (ref. no. 12).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
79	440	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Constructing Nirimba Station at Burdekin Road would result in a more even spacing of Stations between Quakers Hill and Schofields. Locating Nirimba station at this location was documented in the Metropolitan Strategy.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 79 (ref. no. 429 and 431).
79	441	Project design	Relocation of Schofields Station	There is no rational justification to reduce the number of stations on a rail line that is surrounded by an area designated for significant residential development.	Refer to Section 3.2.2 for discussion on the development of the preferred project option. The Project is not reducing the number of stations on the Richmond Branch Line, as the Project has proposed the relocation of Schofields Station.
79	441a	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	Justifying the relocation of Schofields Station by stating that the proposal will enable a larger population to live within walking distance is invalid, as the station is being moved to a proposed high density area.	Higher density housing is proposed near Alex Avenue Precinct. As stated by the Strategies and Land Release Branch *NWGC Alex Avenue and Riverstone Precinct Fact Sheet 3: Infrastructure*, 'the Rail station relocations of Vineyard and Schofields stations will improve access, parking facilities and connections to buses. The Precincts are being planned so that areas of higher density housing will be concentrated along public transport corridors and most homes will be within 400 metres of public transport.'
79	442	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Relocating Schofields 800 metres south will exclude existing Schofields residents from the service.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1), no. 3 (ref. no. 5) and no. 4 (ref. no. 9).
79	443	Traffic and transport	Accessibility	Clarification on the bus service that would operate between existing and new Schofields stations.	Refer to TIDC response to submission no. 1 (ref. no. 1).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
79	444	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	The Environmental Assessment states that detailed consideration has been given to the potential social and economic impacts on Schofields Village. Can this be substantiated?	Section 3.2.1 of this report provides the key socio-economic impacts as raised by submissions as part of the exhibition stage and production of this submissions report. Section 3.2.1 details the socio-economic impact assessment in the EA which focussed specifically on Schofields (refer Section 8.3.4 in EA) and the potential impacts (both positive and negative) that are likely to be experienced by residents and local businesses. As noted in this section of the EA, there was a survey conducted to determine the linkage between rail commuter's use of the shops in Schofields village either to or from the station. This survey methodology was provided in the EA and substantiates the data used in combination with NSW Government plans, the Strategies and Land Release Branch precinct plans and other community, non-government agency and government agency feedback processes which have informed the socio-economic assessment.
79	445	Socio-economic	Relocation of Schofields Station	The Environmental Assessment states that the Schofields community have shown considerable 'interest' in the changes proposed as part of the Project, rather than 'opposing' the Project.	Interest in the Project has reflected both positive and negative feedback, hence the interest level in the Project is not accurately described as purely oppositional.
79	446	Environmental Assessment	Minor error or inconsistency	The Environmental Assessment incorrectly states that Grange Avenue and the St Joseph Catholic Church are 400 metres from the current station, which they are not.	Noted. This has been included in Section 4.1 of this report which discusses clarifications to the Environmental Assessment.
79	447	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*A new Schofields Station is better placed to facilitate the development of greater commercial and retail employment opportunities in close proximity to the new*	Refer to TIDC response to submission no. 79 (ref. no. 431).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
				station, enhancing opportunities for people to live and work in the NWGC This statement has already been acknowledged in the Metropolitan Strategy with regards to the Nirimba town centre and station. No documents or data have been supplied by TIDC to support this with regards to the new Schofields Station.	
79	448	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	Building a Nirimba Station at Burdekin Road would create an immediate opportunity for existing residents of Quakers Hill as they would be within the walking catchment of this Station.	Refer to TIDC response to submission no. 79 (ref. no. 431).
79	449	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	*A new Schofields Station would provide opportunities to integrate a commuter car park and bus/rail interchange within the station* This was already offered with the planned Nirimba Station.	Refer to TIDC response to submission no. 79 (ref. no. 431).
79	450	Project design	Consideration of additional stations	The location of Nirimba Station is not flood prone and could support high density development around this station on a greenfield site.	Refer to TIDC response to submission no. 79 (ref. no. 431).

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
79	451	Other	Documentation to support the Project	No documentation is available which supports the 'whole-of-government' view to relocate Schofields Station. Further detailed planning has been undertaken and this should have been retained in accordance with the *State Records Regulation 2005*.	The Strategies and Land Release Branch Riverstone Precinct Planning Report acknowledges that *'The NSW Government announced a proposal to construct a new station approximately 800 metres south of Schofields Station adjacent to the Alex Avenue Precinct. Planning for the Riverstone Precinct has proceeded on the assumption that Schofields Station will be relocated* (GCC 2008c)*.'* The Alex Avenue Precinct Planning Report (GCC 2008b) also supports whole of government proposal. As a state owned corporation, TIDC comply will all record keeping obligations required by the NSW Government and safety and rail regulators.
79	452	Project justification	Consideration of additional stations	TIDC should be required to validate the statement that *Nirimba Station would not be located at the area proposed to have the highest densities of development as being planned for the NWGC*, as this appears to be incorrect.	As stated in TIDC's response to submission no. 40 (ref. no. 185); submission no. 20 (ref. no. 80) and submission no. 23 (ref. no. 105), Chapter 5 of the EA details the design options considered and provides a justification of why the preferred option was selected. The Environmental Assessment is focussed on assessing the preferred option and does not attempt to assess a range of proposals. TIDC's response to submission no. 79 (ref. no. 441a), higher density housing is planned within 400m of rail station.
79	453	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	There is no requirement to improve the existing Schofields Station with associated bus interchange and car parking facilities, as this station is a local interchange.	This is not proposed as part of the proposal.
79	454	Project justification	Relocation of Schofields Station	There is no requirement to revitalise the Schofields village centre (contrary to the justification provided in the Environmental Assessment for relocating Schofields Station).	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 79 (ref. no. 444) which notes the existence of the revitalisation plan for Schofields village.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
79	455	Project design	Development of preferred option	The preferred option was selected in the absence of supporting documentation being available.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 79 (ref. no. 431).
79	456	Other	Documentation to support the Project	TIDC have failed to comply with Government requirements to maintain adequate records offering support for their decisions.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission no. 79 (ref. no. 451).
79	457	Approvals process	Determination of the Project	The Department of Planning is not impartial to the determination of the Project.	The Minister for Planning will determine the Project. The EP&A Act sets out the procedure for the assessment and determination of major project. Refer to Section 1.4 of the report for further discussion on the determination process for the Project under Part 3A of the EP&A Act. Further to this, s75(j) of the EP&A Act and s8B of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* are noted by TIDC.
79	458	Project Design	Development of preferred project option	Why wasn't a proper investigation undertaken for all options considered in the Environmental Assessment? A number of statements are made in the Environmental Assessment and other planning documents which suggest inter-government agency investigations; however these are not available to the public.	Refer to Section 3.2.2 of the report for discussion on the development of the preferred project option. As demonstrated in Chapter 2, TIDC communications have kept the community and interested stakeholders informed as plans have continued for the NWGC. Plans are released for public exhibition and consultation as they progress.

Submission number	Ref number	Key issue	Sub issue	Issue	TIDC response
79	459	Project Design	Development of preferred project option	A number of statements are made in the Environmental Assessment and other planning documents which suggest inter-government agency investigations; however these are not available to the public.	Refer to TIDC's response to submission 79 (ref. no. 452). This response also refers to TIDC's response to submission no. 40 (ref. no. 185); submission 20 (ref. no. 80) and submission no 23 (ref. no. 105).
79	460	Cumulative impacts	Other development	The Environmental Assessment does not provide a complete list of DA's within 200 metres of the rail corridor.	Noted. This list was correct at the time of writing the Environmental Assessment and was based on Development Applications available on the Blacktown City Council website.
79	461	Traffic and transport	Future road network	The Environmental Assessment is inconsistent in referring to the proposed alignment of the Schofields Road upgrade. Will this road connect to Grange Avenue or South Street?	Noted. Schofields Road is a separate project that the Strategies and Land Release Branch are investigating in conjunction with the RTA. The proposed Schofields Road upgrade is proposed to connect to South Street. This has been documented in the Riverstone Precinct Planning Report (GCC 2008c). The development of the future road network for the NWGC will be undertaken by the Strategies and Land Release Branch and the RTA.
79	462	Traffic and transport	Future road network	The Environmental Assessment suggests that a new road will be constructed between Westminster Street Bridge and Grange Avenue on top of a flood plain.	This is a separate project that is being considered by the Strategies and Land Release Branch and the RTA. The development of the future road network for the NWGC will be undertaken by the Strategies and Land Release Branch and the RTA. Further consultation will be undertaken with the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA with regard to the road network.
79	463	Consultation	Notification of the Project and exhibition process	Very little practical information supplied at the community information sessions.	The Community Information Sessions were opportunities for the community to raise concerns directly with project personnel, including engineering, construction, environmental, design and planning professionals. These issues and record of attendance are detailed in Chapter 2 of this document as a means to develop the key Project issues. Posters and key project details were displayed at the Community Information Sessions. Plans were available to discuss and copies of the Environmental Assessment were available to refer to during these sessions.

Appendix D

Government agency submissions

Table D TIDC's response to government agency submissions received during the exhibition period

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Blacktown City Council	1	Objects to the proposed relocation of Schofields Station.	Noted.
Blacktown City Council	2	Objects to the deferral of the duplication of the track between Schofields and Vineyard as part of the Stage 2 works.	Noted. The NSW Government has deferred Stage 2 to align with growth in the North West Growth Centre.
Blacktown City Council	3	30 days is an inadequate time frame for stakeholders to review the EA and to provide for meaningful community consultation and engagement.	The Department of Planning is responsible for determining whether an extension in the time period of the exhibition of the EA is warranted. The EA was exhibited from 29 April to 1 June, which satisfies the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* requirements to exhibit for a minimum of 30 days. The Department of Planning did not extend the exhibition period past 1 June 2009, however late submissions up to the end of June were received and considered as part of this report.
Blacktown City Council	4	The movement of Schofields Station from its current location will significantly impact on the economic viability of local shops which are currently clustered around the station. The loss of commuter patronage could cause significant loss of income for these shops.	It is likely that the relocation of Schofields Station will result in both positive and negative economic impacts to local businesses in the area. Section 3.2.1 of the report (refer to *Sub-issue 3 – socio-economic impacts*) provides a response regarding the impact to businesses. The Strategies and Land Release Branch (formerly GCC) is currently preparing plans for the revitalisation of the Schofields village centre as part of the development of the NWGC. It is expected that the revitalisation of Schofields village centre will reinforce its role as a neighbourhood centre within the Riverstone precinct. A revitalised village centre would likely lead to sustained or increased patronage for existing businesses.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Blacktown City Council	5	It is expected that the new Schofields Station would include at least some retail facilities, which would further limit the ability of the existing shops to compete and remain economically viable.	The Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication Project includes the relocation of Schofields Station; however the scope of works does not propose retail facilities within the Schofields Station development. The Strategies and Land Release Branch's Alex Avenue Precinct Plan details the planned residential and commercial land use for this precinct. The Alex Avenue commercial centre is likely to have some commercial/retail premises. The revitalisation plan for Schofields is expected to reinforce Schofields village centre's role as a neighbourhood centre within the Riverstone Precinct.
Blacktown City Council	6	Schofields Station is in the centre of an existing residential community. The movement of the Station 800 metres from its current location will leave the existing residential community disadvantaged with a loss of access and inconvenience.	Refer to Section 3.2.1 for discussion on this issue.
Blacktown City Council	7	Many existing Schofields residents will no longer be able to walk to the Station, therefore potentially increasing reliance on private vehicles.	Refer to Section 3.2.1 for discussion on this issue.
Blacktown City Council	8	Council supported the proposed Nirimba Station, as the existing Schofields Station would remain in-situ under this previous proposal.	Section 3.2.2 of the report details the justification for relocating Schofields Station as the preferred project option. This section also details the development of the preferred project option (refer to sub-issue 1) which looks at some of the planning documents and plans as released by the NSW Government and the Strategies and Land Release Branch since 2005 and the refinement of proposed plans and strategies. For further discussion on the proposed decommissioning of existing Schofields Station refer to Table C, Appendix D for TIDC's response to submission no. 23 (ref. no. 104), no. 10 (ref. no. 34) and no. 28 (ref. no. 124).
Blacktown City Council	9	The removal of Schofields Station from the existing community, in lieu of the provision of the previously planned Nirimba Station in addition to the existing Schofields Station (i.e. one station instead of two stations) is an unacceptable outcome for both the existing and future residents.	Refer to Section 3.2.1 and TIDC's response to ref. no. 8.
Blacktown City Council	10	TIDC has indicated that the Schofields Station relocation would proceed, and that such a statement is contrary to advice given publicly by the GCC that no final Government decision has been made.	No final government decision has been made regarding any aspect of the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project. TIDC has prepared an Environmental Assessment for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication to seek Project Approval from the Minister for Planning under Part 3A of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act); and for that purpose, to demonstrate that the Director-General's requirements had been satisfied.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
			Project approval has not yet been granted for this Project. The Minister for planning will determine whether to grant approval under Part 3A of the EP&A Act based on the information provided in the assessment and submissions reports and any advice provided by public authorities.
Blacktown City Council	11	The GCC has stated publically that the reason for the relocation of Schofields Station was because of rail operational requirements. This conflicts with TIDC's justification that the reason was because of broader strategic planning considerations of Government related to the North West Growth Centre. Council wishes to receive clarification regarding these conflicting statements.	Section 5.5.1 of the Environmental Assessment (EA) detailed the reasons why the relocation of Schofields Station was determined to be the preferred option for the Project. Refer to Section 3.2.2 of this report for an overview of the operational and strategic justification for the relocation of Schofields Station. The decision to relocate Schofields Station was made based on a combination of the issues listed in Section 3.2.2, rather than focussing one specific issue.
Blacktown City Council	12	An appropriate 'trigger mechanism' should be used for the future commencement of Stage 2 of the Project (such as population growth). This trigger should be included in the State Government's infrastructure schedule to ensure that the public transport keeps pace with the rate of development.	The Environmental Assessment seeks approval for the full duplication. Refer also to ref. no. 2.
Blacktown City Council	13	Uncertainty surrounding the commencement of Stage 2 could deter interest from the development industry which impacts on the rate of development.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 12.
Blacktown City Council	14	The aims of the Growth Centres SEPP may have been inadequately fulfilled in light of the proposed movement of Schofields Station and the deferment of Stage 2.	Chapter 2 of the EA details the aims of the Growth Centre SEPP. These aims (in conjunction with amendments to the regulations under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* relating to precinct planning) are as follows: (a) to co-ordinate the release of land for residential, employment and other urban development in the North West and South West growth centres of the Sydney Region (b) to enable the Minister from time to time to designate land in those growth centres as ready for release for development (c) to provide for comprehensive planning for those growth centres (d) to enable the establishment of vibrant, sustainable and liveable neighbourhoods that provide for community well-being and high quality local amenity (e) to provide controls for the sustainability of land in those growth centres that has conservation value (f) to provide for the orderly and economic provision of infrastructure in and to those growth centres

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
			(g) to provide development controls in order to protect the health of the waterways in those growth centres (h) to protect and enhance land with natural and cultural heritage value (i) to provide land use and development controls that will contribute to the conservation of biodiversity. The Project is an essential component of the development of the NWGC in providing efficient and reliable public transport for the expected population increase associated with the planned development. The Project is a significant feature of the North West Structure Plan, which aims to develop transit-oriented development on either side of the existing Richmond Branch Line. The Richmond Branch Line is strategically located in the centre of the NWGC and would provide an opportunity to support sustainable land release through the provision of additional rail services to the region. The upgrade of the stations, while not identified in the structure of the plan, are considered consistent with the planning principles for the growth centre. It is considered that the Project is consistent with, and will help facilitate achieving the aims of, the Growth Centres SEPP.
Blacktown City Council	15	The Environmental Assessment does not address the *draft Subregional Planning Strategy* for the North West Subregion, in line with the strategic context of the Project, or the broad aims and directions in the strategy.	The Project satisfies the following aims of the NSW Government's (2005, 2007) Metropolitan Strategy and Subregional Planning Strategy (which is still in draft): (i) Improving the existing transport system in the North West through improving reliability and increase of rail services. (ii) Influencing travel choices to encourage more sustainable travel though improving local and regional walking and cycling networks.
Blacktown City Council	16	Retention and upgrade to the existing Station would be a positive outcome towards revitalisation of the Schofields village centre in line with the aims of the Subregional Strategy and in meeting the demands of population growth in the community and the region.	It is considered the Project does meet the Key Directions for Transport in the North West as referred to in Chapter 5 of the draft Subregional Planning Strategy and fulfils a main aim of integrating transport and land-use opportunities. The Project also fulfils the objectives of the Growth Centres SEPP and Strategies and Land Release Branch Precinct Plans (with particular relevance for Alex Ave, Riverstone and Riverstone West Plans which were available for public exhibition and comment from November 2008 to March 2009). Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 4, 5, 6 and 8 for further discussion of issues related to the proposed relocation of Schofields Station and associated impacts to the Schofields village centre.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Blacktown City Council	17	Council does not object to the proposed relocation of the Sydney Water easement within Oppy Reserve, on the basis that the current flow capacity of existing stormwater infrastructure is maintained.	Noted. TIDC will continue to consult with Sydney Water and Blacktown City Council during detailed design to ensure that the current flow capacity of existing stormwater infrastructure is maintained.
Blacktown City Council	18	TIDC should consult with Council with regards to adequately addressing the implications for Council Land and properties as well as its impact on the wider community.	Noted. TIDC will continue to consult with Blacktown City Council and the community during the development the detailed design. Upon finalisation of the detailed design, TIDC will advise Council of land acquisition requirements for the Project. TIDC will also brief Council Officers on the anticipated impacts of the Project on the wider community prior to the commencement of construction. As described in Section 2.4 of this report, TIDC will continue to consult will the community throughout the pre-construction and construction phases of the Project. TIDC's commitment to ongoing stakeholder consultation is reflected in the Statement of Commitments (refer Chapter 6).
Blacktown City Council	19	The relocation of Schofields Station will not fulfil the broad aims and directions to meet the anticipated population growth and revitalisation of the region outlined in the Metropolitan Strategy and the Subregional Strategy.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 16.
Blacktown City Council	20	The business survey undertaken at Schofields as part of the socio-economic assessment for the Environmental Assessment was limited. A large survey sample could have been undertaken and additional surveys conducted to give a better indication.	Section 3.2.1 (*refer to sub-issue 3*) addresses the economic impacts for local businesses, and references the survey results which provided some background data for the socio-economic impact assessment. Section 3.3.3 of the Environmental Assessment discusses the rail commuter survey undertaken at Schofields Station on Tuesday 14 August 2007, Wednesday 2 July 2008 and Thursday 3 July 2008 to determine typical commuter patterns at this station. The 2008 survey included interviews with a sample of rail commuters to determine the nature of commuter activity, including frequency of use of the station by rail commuters. Commuters were also interviewed regarding their place of origin of travel. The survey had a response rate of 140 commuters. The results of the survey, as documented in Section 3.2 and 8.3 of the EA, provided the following key findings: ▪ 40% of those people surveyed accessed Schofields Station on foot. In the 2007 survey, approximately 20% of these patrons walked from Advance Street or Bridge Street, which are both located close to the existing station; this figure increased to 40% for the 2008 survey.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
			▪ On the day surveyed only 13% of people who used the Schofields village shops did so on their way to and/or from Schofields Station. The survey undertaken by RailCorp represented days which reflected 'usual patronage conditions' to highlight the statistical norm (i.e. outside public holiday, school holiday and peak commuter events such as APEC). It is not expected that conducting additional surveys would yield results that are significantly different to those reported in Sections 3.3 and 8.3 of the Environmental Assessment. As such, these surveys were considered adequate to inform the socio-economic impact study for the EA.
Blacktown City Council	21	The community should have been adequately engaged and included in the planning and decision-making process, and written information should have been provided to residents.	TIDC has encouraged ongoing community involvement in the Project. Community consultation activities that were undertaken by TIDC throughout the development of the Project are described in Chapter 4 of the Environmental Assessment. In summary, a consultation strategy (refer Section 4.2 of the Environmental Assessment) was prepared as part of the Project development to encourage stakeholder and community involvement, and to foster interaction between stakeholders, the community and the Project team. The proposal to relocate Schofields Station was announced by Minister for Transport and the Minister for Planning on 26 February 2008. The Schofields community were notified the next day about the proposed relocation of Schofields Station via a newsletter sent to Schofields residents (refer Section 4.4 of the Environmental Assessment). The newsletter notified the community of the opportunities to become involved in the Project, including the TIDC freecall 1800 number, and email and website details. A community newsletter was distributed in May 2008 to approximately 11,000 residents and business owners along the rail corridor, including the suburbs of Vineyard, Riverstone, Schofields, Marsden Park, Rouse Hill and Quakers Hill. The newsletter was also distributed to approximately 2,000 community members, based on contact details obtained during previous consultation undertaken by the Strategies and Land Release Branch. Two Project information sessions were held at the Riverstone Senior Citizens Hall on 29 and 31 May 2008. Approximately 150 community members attended the information sessions over the 2 days. Community members were invited to make written submissions on the Project, which were used to identify community and stakeholder issues for consideration during the preparation of the Environmental

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
			Assessment. Further community consultation was undertaken during the public exhibition of the Environmental Assessment (refer Chapter 2). Should the Project be approved, TIDC would continue to consult with Project stakeholders, including the community, throughout the pre-construction and construction phases of the Project (refer Chapter 2). In addition, the Department of Planning would also consult with stakeholders with respect to the development of the NWGC. This would form a separate consultation process to this Project and would be managed by the Department of Planning.
Blacktown City Council	22	Council generally supports the precinct planning for Riverstone as it would contribute towards a positive future economic environment for the area.	Noted. TIDC will continue to consult with the Strategies and Land Release Branch to ensure that the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication Project supports the precinct plan for Riverstone.
Blacktown City Council	23	The Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project and the plans for the Garfield Road and Meatworks level crossings should be undertaken concurrently to ensure Council and the community are included in the decision-making process.	The vehicle level crossings at Riverstone Station and at Riverstone (the 'Meatworks' level crossing) are proposed to be removed by the NSW Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA), and RailCorp respectively — the removal of these level crossings does not form part of this Project. The RTA has investigated and assessed a number of route options for the Riverstone Railway Overpass. A grade separated crossing of the rail line would be needed to achieve the optimal benefit from Stage 2 of the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Project. The construction of Stage 2 of the proposed Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication would be coordinated with RailCorp, RTA, TIDC and the Strategies and Land Release Branch to ensure that this Project does not preclude RTA or RailCorp plans for Riverstone Railway Overpass and Meatworks level crossing, respectively.
Blacktown City Council	24	Inadequate parking will be provided at new Schofields Station, which will result in a negative impact on nearby local streets.	The concept plan for new Schofields Station includes a combined total of 230 spaces, provided collectively on both eastern and western sides of the rail line. The provision of additional parking is not precluded by the project. However, the provision of further parking will be determined in line with the growth of the Schofields Precinct and demand along the Richmond Branch Line in consultation with MoT, the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RailCorp.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Blacktown City Council	25	Unclear what pedestrian facilities have been allowed for to assist commuters to cross Railway Terrace or other major roads when parked in local streets.	A pedestrian level crossing will be provided between the new Vineyard Station and associated Phase 1 carpark to assist pedestrians cross Riverstone Parade. Pedestrian crossings will also be provided within the eastern carpark at Schofields Station to assist commuters access the station from the carpark and bus interchange facilities. In addition, the speed limit around each station is proposed to be 50 km/h. The design of the proposed new car park at Schofields Station and Railway Terrace does not make any provision for pedestrians crossing Railway Terrace. The preliminary project design layout included bus bays and kiss-and-ride bays on both sides of Railway Terrace with a pedestrian crossing to access the station. This was designed in line with Blacktown Council's view that the interchange should be off-line from Railway Terrace, moving pedestrian activity/movements away from the roadway. The design does not attempt to predict or preclude the precinct plans of the Strategies and Land Release Branch, which will include property and road development as well as the overall pedestrian and cycle strategy.
Blacktown City Council	26	Unclear how much commuter car parking will be provided at Riverstone Station, or the potential location of this parking. Adequate parking should be provided at Riverstone Station.	Refer Section 3.3.5 of the report for discussion on commuter car parking provisions to be delivered as part of the Project.
Blacktown City Council	27	The Environmental Assessment does not provide information about the operational impact of kiss-and-ride supply and demand at Riverstone Station during the opening of the Project and in the future.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 28. Chapter 4 of the Traffic and Transport Technical Paper provides an assessment of the operational impacts of the Project. This section of the Technical Paper estimated the space and infrastructure required to support access to each station, with an assumption of how future passengers would travel to the stations. This mode share was applied to the passenger forecasts to calculate the infrastructure required to support the growth targets.
Blacktown City Council	28	Kiss-and-ride provisions at Riverstone Station will be insufficient to meet the demand at the opening of the Project.	Noted. Section 4.4 of the Traffic and Transport Technical Paper notes that the peak space forecasts for kiss-and-ride have been developed as follows: ▪ The demands (6 am–9.30 am) indicated in Table 4-4 were multiplied by 0.5 to yield a peak hour demand. The 0.5 value is the expansion factor used for outer metropolitan stations extracted from A Compendium of CityRail Travel Statistics (2006). ▪ The same demand was assumed for the afternoon peak. The afternoon peak presents the greatest demand for kiss–and–ride space, as pickup dwell time is often greater than drop off as drivers tend to arrive earlier and wait for train arrival.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
			▪ An average afternoon peak wait time of 1 minute is assumed and averaged across the hour. In reality, demand may be greater at times as vehicle arrivals could cluster around timetabled arrivals, therefore, the figures in Table 4-5 should be considered a minimum demand. It should be noted that kiss-and-ride activity can also take place in unspecified car park spaces located around the station. Table 4-5 estimates a minimum of 11 kiss-and-ride spaces estimated to meet demand for Riverstone Station. ▪ Queue probability analysis was used to calculate the number of spaces required.
Blacktown City Council	29	The operational traffic impact to Bridge Street was not investigated in the Environmental Assessment. Further investigation is required to mitigate impacts on the residents of Bridge Street.	Section 8.2 and 8.4 of the EA, as detailed from the Technical Papers (Traffic and Transport and Noise) has addressed operational traffic and noise impacts from the Project. This did include assessment of traffic access the station on the western side upon completion at 2011 and road noise along Bridge Street. Further assessment of traffic noise impacts to Bridge Street has been undertaken since the exhibition of the Environmental Assessment. The addendum to the Noise and Vibration Technical Paper is provided in Appendix F, and summarised in Section 4.1.2.
Blacktown City Council	30	A Traffic Management Plan must be prepared for the Project and this should address noise issues along construction vehicle routes.	Noted. As stated in SoC no. 16, construction traffic impacts are to be managed in accordance with a three-level hierarchy of plans: 1. High level Traffic Management Reports prepared for local government areas that address cumulative traffic impacts across a number of construction work sites. 2. Site-specific Traffic Management Plans that focus on individual construction work sites. 3. Traffic Control Plans for each location where works are proposed in the road or that would affect trafficable areas.
Blacktown City Council	31	Alternative pedestrian and vehicle access must be provided wherever a local road needs to be temporarily closed.	Noted. Closure of local roads will be minimised and appropriate alternative routes and traffic controls will be implemented. A Traffic Management Plan will be drafted to include provisions for road closures where necessary as part of the Stage 1 Project works.
Blacktown City Council	32	Proposed construction vehicle routes are generally considered appropriate. However, every attempt should be made to avoid the use of local roads if a suitable alternative route is available.	Noted. As described in Section 8.2.1 of the Environmental Assessment, the following principles would be used to determine construction vehicle routes: ▪ travel the most direct route ▪ use currently identified B-double routes

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
			▪ avoid routes that may affect schools, childcare centres or shopping precincts ▪ avoid the use of local roads ▪ avoid the use of roads with road weight restrictions and/or bridge height clearance limit ▪ use roads in accordance with the road hierarchy: state roads (RTA-controlled), regional roads (council-controlled) then local roads (council-controlled). The proposed vehicle construction routes for the Project are shown in Figures 4-1 and 4-2.
Blacktown City Council	33	Routes for oversized vehicles to follow approved routes and avoid local streets where possible.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 32.
Blacktown City Council	34	The Environmental Assessment does not directly consider the likely future development alongside the rail corridor. This is inadequate because noise impacts upon any future development must be considered as part of the planning process.	Refer to Section 3.3.1 for discussion on this issue.
Blacktown City Council	35	Adjacent heritage items that may be affected by the Project have not been addressed by the Heritage Impact Statement, including: ▪ 7 and 17 Richards Avenue ▪ 4 Garfield Road West ▪ 22 West Parade ▪ The War Memorial (minimal). The likely impact to these items should be addressed.	A detailed heritage assessment was completed as part of the Environmental Assessment (refer Technical Paper 3 in Volume 2). This assessment identified heritage items that would be either directly or indirectly impacted by the Project. Additional heritage items adjacent to the Project (as identified by Council) were not included in the heritage assessment as they were outside of the impact area of the Project. As such no further assessment is warranted for these heritage items.
Blacktown City Council	36	The recommendations provided in the Environmental Assessment to protect heritage items are supported.	Noted.
Blacktown City Council	37	Works around Riverstone Railway Station are to be monitored for potential archaeological remains.	Noted. As stated in SoC no. 29, TIDC will prepare, as part of the CEMP, a procedure to follow if previously unidentified heritage items are uncovered.
Blacktown City Council	38	Requests a copy of the archival records are placed in the Blacktown Library.	Noted. TIDC will provide a copy of the archival records to Blacktown Library.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Blacktown City Council	39	Council must be included in the decision-making process or the design and location of the interpretative signage at Riverstone Railway Station.	Noted. As described in SoC no. 31, heritage interpretation would be incorporated into the Project to provide information on the history of the Riverstone Station Complex as well as the significance of the Richmond Line. Heritage interpretation will be developed in consultation with the Heritage Branch, Blacktown City Council, RailCorp, the Historical Society and other interested community groups.
Blacktown City Council	40	The Environmental Assessment does not appear to provide a comprehensive list of culverts or enough details to assess the conclusions of the flooding report.	The information documented in the Environmental Assessment provided a summary of the key culverts within the Project area, based on the detailed Hydraulic Assessment (Maunsell 2007). As such, the Environmental Assessment did not include a comprehensive list of all of the culverts that intersect the rail line over the Project area. Notwithstanding this, all culverts were assessed in the detailed Hydraulic Assessment (Maunsell 2007). Table 3-4 provides information for all culverts that would intersect the rail line over the Stage 1 project area. SoC no. 35 states that TIDC will prepare a Flood Impact Assessment in consultation with relevant agencies and councils during detailed design. As part of the detailed design process for Stage 1, RLA has reviewed this assessment and further modelled each impacted culvert between Quakers Hill and Schofields to confirm the findings in the EA. As part of this process RLA/TIDC will consult with BCC and DECC regarding the modelling and the design of each culvert. For the Stage 2 design, the same process will be applied.
Blacktown City Council	41	Further investigation required to address groundwater and salinity issues.	As described in Section 3.7.2 of the Environmental Assessment, further geotechnical investigation would be undertaken during detailed design to obtain information on the site hydrogeology. In addition, SoC no. 34 states that detailed design would be undertaken to minimise any impacts in association with the project on identified saline groundwater.
Blacktown City Council	42	All works shall comply with Council's policies on water quality and quantity.	Noted. As described in Section 8.7.3, measures would be implemented to control water quality and hydrologic impacts during the construction of the Project. These measures would be detailed in the soil and water quality management plan within the CEMP. These measures would be identified in consultation with relevant government agencies and councils, and would be consistent with the principles and practices detailed in Landcom's (2004) *Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction*. SoC no. 35 states that TIDC will prepare a Flood Impact Assessment in consultation with relevant agencies and councils during detailed design.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Blacktown City Council	43	Modelling needs to be undertaken to support the conclusion of the Environmental Assessment that the Project will not have an adverse impact on the flooding regime as a result of the proposed works.	As stated in SoC no. 35, the Proponent will prepare a Flood Impact Assessment in consultation with relevant agencies and councils during detailed design. The assessment shall include modelling of potential flood impacts as a result of the Project, including consideration of embankment widening (filling) activities within the floodplain, and culvert extension/replacement works. The assessment shall inform the detailed design process to ensure that the Project works do not exacerbate existing flood impacts at properties adjoining the corridor for storms up to the 1:100 year ARI event. The Flooding and Drainage Plan will be finalised in consultation with key stakeholders (e.g. BCC) and submitted to DoP. This will illustrate that the project will not have an adverse impact on the flooding regime as a result of the proposed works.
Blacktown City Council	44	Council recommends that the draft Statement of Commitments be finalised and included as conditions of consent to ensure such works are undertaken by the proponent.	The draft Statement of Commitments (SoCs) presented in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Assessment have been amended and finalised, based on the outcomes of additional investigations detailed in Chapter 4 and the consideration of the submissions received on the Project (refer Chapter 3). The final SoCs for the Project are provided in Chapter 6 (refer Table 6-1) and describe the measures that TIDC will commit to during the pre-construction, construction and operational phases of the Project to manage the impacts identified in the Environmental Assessment and subsequent issues identified during the preparation of the Submissions Report. The final SoCs will be considered by the Department of Planning in assessing the Project. Should approval be granted by the Minister for Planning, approval conditions would take into consideration the final SoCs proposed for the Project. Following Project approval, the finalised commitments would guide subsequent phases of the proposed development. Any consortium or contractor selected to undertake further planning, design, construction and/or operation phases of the proposed upgrade would be required to undertake all works in accordance with the final SoCs and Conditions of Approval.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Strategies and Land Release Branch of the Department of Planning	45	Location of pedestrian access on the eastern side of new Schofields Station should include south-facing stairs linking the station to the intersection of the Main Street (current intersection of Pelican Road and Railway Terrace).	Moving the stairs to face south would result in an increase in the walking distance between the existing and new Schofields stations. In addition, the positioning of the entrance stair would not align with the proposed carpark pedestrian crossing. To alter the pedestrian crossing would give rise to the following issues: ▪ the potential for traffic disruption caused by buses queuing around the roundabout from Railway Terrace, thereby blocking the principal entrance to the station from the east ▪ the loss of one bus parking bay, ultimately resulting in the buses parking in front of the pedestrian crossing which is not desirable ▪ the proposed carpark arrangement maximises the available land and consequently any alteration to cater for the above would have considerable impact on the provision of car parking and the transport interchange ▪ result in the lift in a position closer to the rail which would not be desirable because it would have to be designed for full collision loading from a train (the structural supports are presently positioned so that they do not have to be designed for full collision loading). Refer also to TIDC's response to submission no. 40 (ref. no. 197) in the non-government agency issue table (refer Appendix C).
Strategies and Land Release branch of the Department of Planning	46	The new road that provides access to the commuter car park on the western side of new Schofields Station should be designed to be easily upgraded as a future street that can cater for bus stops, kiss-and-ride and taxis.	The proposed road carriageway is designed as a private road capable of catering for buses. There is provision for kiss-and-ride facility on the western side of the new Schofields Station. The road alignment (radii) is not suitable for a 60km/hr road; and additional land would need to be acquired to allow for increased turning radii. The car park is designed as an off-street car park along a 40km/hr road that would be further controlled with speed humps designed for 25km/hr. A 60km/hr road would effectively require an additional carriageway width of approximately 1 metre per lane to allow for cars to safely access/egress the parking bays. The design of the road and carpark on the western side of new Schofields Station do not preclude the ability to upgrade this road in the future, if required.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Strategies and Land Release branch of the Department of Planning	47	The alignment of the new access road from Bridge Street should be designed to meet 60 km/h design standards.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 46.
Strategies and Land Release branch of the Department of Planning	48	A more suitable location for the pedestrian footbridge at Riverstone Station would be north of the existing station. This arrangement would also improve the landscaped area in front of the station and allow for more area for the bus interchange.	Noted. This would be considered during the detailed design in consultation with the RTA, the Strategies and Land Release Branch, the Heritage Branch of the Department of Planning, RailCorp and MoT. Refer also to ref. no. 60.
Strategies and Land Release branch of the Department of Planning	49	The current design does not indicate any access to the western side of Vineyard station where a significant proportion of employment within the Riverstone West precinct will be generated. The concept design for Vineyard Station must therefore ensure that the station can be easily upgraded to allow access to the precinct.	TIDC will continue to consult with the Strategies and Land Release Branch. This will include discussions regarding the design of western access at Vineyard Station, which would be considered during the detailed design of Stage 2 as the Riverstone and Riverstone West precinct plans are finalised. The Project will not preclude the addition of access from the western side of the rail line in the future.
Strategies and Land Release branch of the Department of Planning	50	Phase 2 of the Vineyard Station commuter carpark should be relocated north of the Phase 1 car park. The Phase 2 car park is currently located outside the Sydney Water Sewerage Treatment Plant Odour Zone and is using developable land which the draft Riverstone Precinct Plan indicates as the location of the new Vineyard town centre.	Noted. As described in Section 6.2.1 of the Environmental Assessment, the exact location of the Phase 2 car park would be determined following more detailed site investigations and consideration of alternative locations (such as on the western side of the station). TIDC would continue to consult with the Strategies and Land Release Branch to ensure that its plans for the Riverstone Precinct are not precluded by the construction of the Phase 2 car park. Further discussion on the location of the Phase 2 car park is provided in TIDC's response to ref. no. 155, and submission nos 21, 59 and 66 in Appendix C (non-government agency submissions).
Strategies and Land Release branch of the Department of Planning	51	The road alignment of the intersection of Ashford Road and Riverstone Parade should also be considered in the design and location of car parking at Vineyard Station. Bus routes are anticipated to be using this intersection, and it is necessary to provide safe sight lines for turning vehicles. Possible solutions which should be considered include realignment of Ashford Road or provision for a left turn slip lane addition to the current proposed intersection. The location of car parking should not impede alterations to the intersection in the future.	Noted. The road alignment of the intersection of Ashford Road and Riverstone Parade will be considered further in conjunction with the Strategies and Land Release Branch, BCC and RTA during the detailed design stage of the Project. This intersection would also be considered in conjunction with the development of the Phase 2 car park at Vineyard Station (refer to ref. no. 50) for discussion on the Phase 2 car park).

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Strategies and Land Release branch of the Department of Planning	52	The location of the Schofields Substation may impact on the design, location and cost of the Burdekin Road overpass and land availability for trunk infrastructure south of Burdekin Road. Maintenance access to the substation is also required to be resolved both in the short-term and once the Precinct is developed. The Strategies and Land Release branch requests ongoing consultation with TIDC to resolve this issue.	Noted. The preliminary investigation indicates that the potential conflict between the Schofields Substation and Burdekin Road are minor and can be resolved during the detailed design. The conflict may require the location of substation to move slightly east of the location proposed in the Environmental Assessment (likely to be in the order of 3 metres). The exact location of the substation would be determined during the detailed design and in consultation with the Strategies and Land Release Branch, RailCorp and RTA. Should the location of the substation be required to be substantially modified, TIDC would undertake a revised assessment for the new substation location as a modification to the Project. TIDC would also consult with the landowner to advise of any modified land acquisition requirements for the Project.
Strategies and Land Release branch of the Department of Planning	53	The relocation of the existing Schofields Substation is required before the Schofields Road overpass is constructed. As such the timing of the relocation of the substation should be during Stage 1 of the Project. TIDC should continue to consult with Blacktown Council, the RTA and the Strategies and Land Release branch to resolve this issue.	Noted. It is proposed that the relocation of Schofields Substation will occur prior to the construction of Schofields Road overpass. Whether this will be undertaken during Stage 1 or 2 is dependent on the outcomes of the Power Study for the Project and the operational timetable. TIDC will continue to consult with Blacktown Council, the RTA and the Strategies and Land Release branch to resolve this issue.
Strategies and Land Release branch of the Department of Planning	54	The Department is currently investigating the viability of the Westminster Road overpass in the planning for the Riverstone Precinct. The Strategies and Land Release branch will keep TIDC informed about decisions regarding this overpass, which forms part of Stage 2 of the Project.	Noted. TIDC proposes to reconstruct Westminster Bridge as part of Stage 2 of the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication. TIDC will continue to consult with the Strategies and Land Release Branch about proposed road crossings of the rail line and the road network.
Hawkesbury City Council	55	The Project should incorporate improved road access to the west for suburbs such as Shanes Park, Llandilo, Berkshire Park, Windsor Downs, etc.	This is outside the proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project. The provision of additional road infrastructure is being coordinated by the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA as part of the NWGC. TIDC will continue to consult with the key agencies about proposed road infrastructure.
Hawkesbury City Council	56	The Project should facilitate the provision of a bus connection from the Western Line to the Richmond Line and Rouse Hill.	As described in TIDC's response to the non-government submission no. 1 (reference number 1), the MoT is currently undertaking an extensive review of metropolitan bus services in accordance with the recommendations of the Unsworth Review. With the provision of bus interchange facilities at the new Schofields and Vineyard stations, the project would support a potential bus connection from the Western Line to the Richmond Line and Rouse Hill. However, this would be determined by MoT.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Hawkesbury City Council	57	The Project should provide improved commuter car parking at Vineyard Railway Station.	The Environmental Assessment proposes to provide a commuter car park at Vineyard Station for up to 220 vehicles. Initially Phase 1 of the car park would cater for 70 vehicles. Phase 2 would be constructed at a later date and would be developed in consultation with the Strategies and Land Release Branch, RailCorp, MoT and BCC.
Roads and Traffic Authority	58	TIDC is to collaborate with the RTA to ensure that the detailed design and construction of the Project facilitates a cost-effective future rail crossing at Schofields Road and Garfield Road.	Noted. TIDC will continue to consult with the RTA during the development of the detailed design to ensure that components of the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication do not preclude any future RTA proposals.
Roads and Traffic Authority	59	The detailed design is to be prepared in a manner that incorporates adequate inter-modal connections linking east and west of the proposed Schofields Station and linking either side of the proposed station to Schofields Road, and its associated shared pedestrian cycleways.	Noted. The Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA have not yet released plans for the Schofields Road upgrade. Such inter-modal linkages would be considered during the development of the detailed design. TIDC would continue to consult with the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA with the view to not preclude any future linkages.
Roads and Traffic Authority	60	The proposed new pedestrian bridge at Riverstone Station is to be designed in collaboration with the RTA to ensure appropriate pedestrian connectivity across the rail line upon closure of the existing Garfield Road level crossing.	Noted. The detailed design of the pedestrian footbridge at Riverstone Station would be developed in consultation with the RTA, the Strategies and Land Release Branch, the Heritage Branch of the Department of Planning, RailCorp and MoT. Refer also to ref. no. 48.
Roads and Traffic Authority	61	RTA would not object to the proposed development on property grounds providing no new buildings or structures are erected on the land required for road widening along Garfield Road.	Noted. The Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication will not require structures to be erected within land required for the widening of Garfield Road. TIDC would continue to consult with the RTA during the detailed design of the Project to ensure that the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication does not prelude future RTA proposals.
Roads and Traffic Authority	62	The traffic and transport assessment fails to examine intersection performance in the future (and accessibility to Railway Stations) as a result of growth within the NWGC. The report should consider these future impacts to the network to ensure that it incorporates traffic forecasts and projections by the Growth Centres.	TIDC is continuing to consult with the Strategies and Land Release Branch, MoT, RailCorp and RTA about plans for the future road network for the NWGC. The design of the stations and interchanges would allow for adequate intersection performance on opening of the Project, and would not preclude future intersection treatments as additional roads and intersections are constructed as the growth centre develops. Detailed analysis of future intersection performance was not possible in the absence of detailed road network plans. The traffic and transport assessment did provide an assessment of future intersection performance in circumstances where existing intersections were expected to remain unchanged. TIDC would continue to consult with these agencies about the modelling of future intersection performance.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Roads and Traffic Authority	63	The traffic and transport assessment does not consider accessibility needs in relation to the road network and the impacts generated by the layouts proposed at each Railway Station.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 62.
Roads and Traffic Authority	64	Consideration should be given for three interchanges to identify intersections in the vicinity of these interchanges that may carry 6 buses per hour (or more), to ensure sufficient land is made available to provide bus priority when needed in the future.	As described in Section 5.1.2 of the Traffic and Transport Technical Paper (refer Volume 2 of the EA), the new Schofields Station would deliver a three bus bay interchange on the eastern side of the Station, which could serve up to 45 buses per hour, which was determined as being adequate to meet demand up to 2031. As described in Section 5.1.4 of the Traffic and Transport Technical Paper (refer Volume 2 of the EA), the new Vineyard Station would deliver a 69 metre long bus zone which would have sufficient space for five buses and could accommodate up to 75 buses per hour, which was determined to be adequate to meet demand up to 2031. TIDC will continue to consult with MoT, the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA about potential future bus numbers and routes as well as future intersections.
Roads and Traffic Authority	65	Concerned that parking demand currently exceeds formal commuter supply at Quakers Hill and Riverstone Rail Stations and will also exceed formal commuter supply in the short/medium term at Schofields Rail Station. With the development of the NWGC, the demand for commuter parking will increase.	Refer Section 3.5.5 for discussion on commuter car parking provisions at these stations.
Roads and Traffic Authority	66	RTA strongly urges the implementation of additional commuter car parking spaces at Quakers Hill, Schofields and Riverstone Stations (i.e. to meet current and short-term future demand). This should include the possible provision of co-sharing commuter parking arrangements with retail centre car parks located in close proximity to the Rail stations (i.e. areas cordoned off during weekdays).	Refer Section 3.3.5 of the report for discussion on commuter car parking at these stations.
Roads and Traffic Authority	67	The Project should depict and incorporate the allocation of land for the future expansion of Railway commuter parking facilities. This land can potentially be residue land adjacent to the Railway corridor.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 65 and 66. TIDC will continue to consult with MoT, RailCorp, Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA about the provision of future commuter parking facilities in conjunction with the planning and development of the NWGC.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Roads and Traffic Authority	68	Forecast station access mode share assumptions in 2031 for cars are too low.	The 2031 access to station mode shares were developed through a rigorous analysis as described in Section 4.1 of the Transport Technical Paper. The car mode share of 55% for Vineyard and 48% for Riverstone and Schofields considers the following: ▪ It was assumed that significantly improved bus services would be provided as the surrounding residential areas are developed (currently being reviewed by MoT). These services would support the proposed development of improved bus interchange facilities at each of the stations. Bus mode share was assumed to increase to 22% (1999 average of outer Sydney suburban stations, Transport and Population Data Centre 1999). ▪ The mode share assumptions already exist at Sydney stations that are considered equivalent in population and density to the proposed 2031 situation surrounding the Richmond rail line. ▪ The 1999 average car mode share for outer Sydney suburban stations (Transport and Population Data Centre 1999) is 41%.
Roads and Traffic Authority	69	To minimise the increased use of motor vehicles it is recommended that consideration be given to increasing the number of bus services to the stations. Should these services not be provided, then the RTA believes that the station access demand for cars is low and not reflective of the future needs for planning of support facilities.	Refer Section 3.2.1 for discussion on the MoT's review of metropolitan bus services in accordance with the recommendations of the Unsworth Review and the Station Transition Plan. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 68 for discussion on the station access mode share assumptions in 2031.
Roads and Traffic Authority	70	The traffic and transport assessment suggests the segregation of the railway station function in terms of 'Park-and-Ride' and also 'Public Transport Interchange' stations. However the report does not apply or provide any details of this principle to the stations under current review. Further clarification is required on this matter as it affects bus planning (e.g. increased storage area for buses and also affects commuter parking sizing).	Noted. This principle will be considered during the detailed design of the station interchanges in consultation with the RTA, Strategies and Land Release Branch, MoT and RailCorp.
Roads and Traffic Authority	71	The entry and exit points to the stations and lifts within the stations should be bicycle friendly.	Noted. The design of the stations will allow for pedestrian and cyclist access across the rail line. This will be further developed during the detailed design in consultation with the RTA, Strategies and Land Release Branch, MoT and RailCorp.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Roads and Traffic Authority	72	Any proposed new bridges, underpasses and drainage culvert extensions associated with the Project must be designed and constructed to enable the construction of the proposed GCC bicycle and pedestrian paths. This also includes the provision of a shared path for the proposed bridge on Westminster Street.	Noted. TIDC will continue to consult with the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA with regard to proposed bicycle and pedestrian paths to ensure that the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication does not preclude such developments. Refer also to ref. no. 54.
Roads and Traffic Authority	73	Any designs and landscaping must not impact upon the sight distance for cyclists.	Noted. This will be considered during the development of the detailed design.
Roads and Traffic Authority	74	There must be enough space to provide a 3 metre wide shared bicycle/ pedestrian path with 500mm clearance on either side. Additional land may be required to place signs and other utilities.	Noted. These requirements will be considered, where possible to be adopted, during the development of the detailed design of the proposed shared user pathway between the existing and new Schofields stations in consultation with BCC.
Roads and Traffic Authority	75	There are to be no obstructions on the bicycle/ pedestrian path, including poles, signs, or any other obstructions.	Noted. This will be considered during detailed design in consultation with BCC.
Roads and Traffic Authority	76	All off-road cycleways are to be constructed from concrete or similar material acceptable for a regional commuter cycleway.	Noted. This will be considered during detailed design in consultation with BCC.
Roads and Traffic Authority	77	Roundabouts are not suitable intersection treatments for cyclists and pedestrians.	Noted. Roundabouts are not proposed to be constructed at pedestrian or cyclist crossings. Pedestrian and cyclist desire lines will be considered further during detailed design. As discussed in TIDC's response to ref. no. 25, there are no provisions for specific pedestrian or cyclist crossings at Schofields Station. The basis of this was to ensure the design does not attempt to predict or preclude the area development plans of the Strategies and Land Release Branch which will include property and road development as well as overall pedestrian and cycle strategy. The design of the shared user pathway and station interchanges would be further developed during the detailed design in consultation with the RTA. The design of these components of the project would support the Strategies and Land Release's pedestrian and cycle strategy.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Roads and Traffic Authority	78	A suitable crossing for cyclists and pedestrians over the Bandon Road Railway underpass is required. This should be incorporated as part of the proposed new rail bridge crossing over Bandon Road.	The proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project finishes south of the Bandon Road level crossing. The provision of additional road infrastructure north of the Project is being coordinated by the Strategies and Land Release Branch and RTA in consultation with other agencies. Notwithstanding this, the Project does not preclude the construction of a cyclist/pedestrian crossing over Bandon Road in the future.
Roads and Traffic Authority	79	It is recommended that two additional bicycle/pedestrian crossings are provided approximately 1 km apart between Riverstone and Vineyard Stations, either as an overpass or underpass.	This is outside of the proposed scope of works for the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication project. The development of additional cycleway infrastructure alongside the rail corridor is being planned by the Strategies and Land Release Branch through the development of the NWGC. An indicative plan of cycle paths proposed to be developed by the Strategies and Land Release Branch is shown in Figure 4-4.
Roads and Traffic Authority	80	A comprehensive Construction Management Plan is to be prepared and submitted to Council, RTA and the Department of Planning for approval prior to the commencement of woks. This plan should address issues related to noise/access during construction, construction vehicle management, parking for construction workers, public transport access, emergency vehicle access, and pedestrian accessibility to the affected rail stations.	Noted. Refer to SoC no. 5 and nos 16 to 23.
Roads and Traffic Authority	81	TIDC must prepare and submit a Traffic Management Plan (to Council/RTA) for approval to address any temporary road closures.	Noted. As stated in SoC no. 16, construction traffic impacts are to be managed in accordance with a three-level hierarchy of plans: 1. High level Traffic Management Reports prepared for local government areas that address cumulative traffic impacts across a number of construction work sites. 2. Site-specific Traffic Management Plans that focus on individual construction work sites. 3. Traffic Control Plans for each location where works are proposed in the road or that would affect trafficable areas. These plans would be prepared prior to construction and would be submitted to both the RTA and Blacktown City Council for review.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Roads and Traffic Authority	82	Ensure that the existing parking provision is not noticeably reduced during construction.	Noted. A CEMP would be prepared for this Project. This CEMP would address traffic and transport management throughout construction. Appropriate provisions will be included in the CEMP to manage this issue. Where existing commuter parking is impacted during construction, the Project would seek to have this parking replaced at a ratio of at least 1:1.
Roads and Traffic Authority	83	The layout of the proposed car parking areas associated with the subject development.	The proposed car parking layout for the new Schofields and Vineyard stations is shown Figures 6-2 and 6-6 in the Environmental Assessment, respectively. The layout of these carparks will be further refined during detailed design.
Roads and Traffic Authority	84	All works and regulatory signposting associated with the proposed development are to be at no cost to the RTA.	Noted.
Department of Water and Energy	85	Any disturbance of watercourses and riparian corridors associated with the proposal must be rehabilitated to emulate a naturalised system for aquatic and terrestrial environments.	Noted. In areas where the rail line crosses watercourses, culvert treatments would be applied in accordance with DWE *Guidelines for Controlled Activities Watercourse Crossings* (February 2008) and *Why do Fish Need to Cross the Road? Fish passage requirements for waterway crossings* (Fairfull and Witheridge 2003). However, outside these areas, and as stated in SoC no. 32, TIDC will prepare a flora and fauna management measures as part of the CEMP, which would include a procedure for progressively revegetating and reinstating disturbed areas using locally endemic native plants for revegetation. Such rehabilitation work would be undertaken in accordance with DWE *Guidelines for Controlled Activities: In-stream Works* (February 2008).
Department of Water and Energy	86	Any disturbance of riparian corridors should be rehabilitated with fully structured local native riparian vegetation (trees, shrubs and groundcover species) in accordance with the stream categorisation and at a density that would occur naturally.	Noted. As discussed in TIDC's response to ref. no. 85, appropriate measures to address this issue will be included in the CEMP. Such measures will be developed in consultation with the land owner. TIDC will also continue to consult with the Strategies and Land Release Branch to ensure that the project works consider the broader context of riparian/terrestrial connectivity within the precinct plans for the NWGC.
Department of Water and Energy	87	Two culvert crossings have been mapped by DWE as Category 2 watercourses (culvert no. 10 and 12). Category 2 watercourses require a minimum 30 metre wide riparian corridor (measured horizontally landward from the top of bank) either side of the creek.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 85.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Department of Water and Energy	88	Two culvert crossings have been mapped by DWE as Category 3 watercourses (culvert no. 2 and 11). Category 3 watercourses require a minimum 10 metre wide riparian corridor (measured horizontally landward from the top of bank) either side of the creek.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 85.
Department of Water and Energy	89	For Category 2 watercourse crossings, DWE encourages the replacement of culverts with bridge crossings. If the culverts are to be retained, the culvert bases should be naturalised to enhance aquatic/riparian connectivity.	No Category 2 watercourses would be crossed during Stage 1 of the Project. The watercourses encountered in Stage 1 are Category 3 watercourses and the proposal is to extend the existing pipe culverts. Consequently there is no significant opportunity to naturalise the culvert base, although the riparian vegetation will be rehabilitated in consultation with DECC and Strategies and Land Release Branch plans. Category 2 watercourses would be crossed during Stage 2 of the Project. The opportunity to naturalise culvert bases for these crossings would be considered during detailed design for Stage 2. Where possible, the watercourse crossings would be revegetated in accordance with DWE *Guidelines for Controlled Activities: In-stream Works* (February 2008). TIDC would consult with landowners and the Strategies and Land Release Branch to ensure that the project works consider the broader context of riparian/terrestrial connectivity within the precinct plans for the NWGC. Refer also to TIDC's response to ref. no. 85 and no. 91.
Department of Water and Energy	90	Concerned that the Environmental Assessment indicates that the reconstruction of a number of drainage culverts may increase the velocity of stream flows. The crossings should not be designed to increase stream flow as this is likely to have impacts on the stability of the bed and banks of the watercourses. The capacity of culverts should be designed to reflect natural stream flow conditions.	Flow velocities would not be significantly increased as a result of the project and the stability of the bed and banks will be managed through the downstream treatments (including scour protection). Consequently the capacity of culverts will be designed to reflect natural stream flow conditions. The detailed designs will be prepared in consultation with relevant stakeholders (e.g. DWE).
Department of Water and Energy	91	Crossing design should consider the riparian/terrestrial connectivity in addition to the requirement of fish and the in-stream environment.	Noted. TIDC will consult with land owners and the Strategies and Land Release Branch to ensure that the project works consider the broader context of riparian/terrestrial connectivity within the precinct plans for the NWGC.
Department of Water and Energy	92	Reference should be made to the DWE *Guidelines for Controlled Activities Watercourse Crossings*.	Noted. This guideline will be adopted during the detailed design and construction phases of the Project.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Department of Water and Energy	93	DWE preference is for crossings to be made wider to minimise the requirements for scour protection.	As described in TIDC's response to ref. no. 90, the Project will extend existing pipe culverts and therefore there is no significant opportunity to make crossings wider and therefore downstream treatments will likely include scour protection. The detailed designs will be prepared in consultation with relevant stakeholders (e.g. DWE).
Department of Water and Energy	94	If the proposal is likely to intercept groundwater, a licence may be required from DWE under Part 5 of the *Water Act 1912*. The Department will assess the need for a water licence once more detailed Project information is available and provided to the Department.	Noted. TIDC will consult with DWE upon finalisation of the detailed design to confirm whether a water licence is required for the Project.
Department of Water and Energy	95	The need for a water licence should be discussed with DWE.	Noted. TIDC will consult with DWE during the development of the detailed design and preparation of Environmental Management Plans for the Project.
Department of Water and Energy	96	All works and disturbance areas associated with the proposal (with exception of the crossing upgrades) must be located outside the riparian zones and must not compromise the riparian zones in any way.	Noted. All construction compounds are proposed to be located outside of the riparian zones.
Department of Water and Energy	97	All watercourse affected by the proposal must be rehabilitated to emulate a natural stream system that behaves as, and has the appearance of a stable natural stream system of the area.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 85.
Department of Water and Energy	98	The rehabilitation of watercourses must be consistent with the DWE *Guidelines for Controlled Activities: In-stream Works*.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 85.
Department of Water and Energy	99	All riparian zones must be rehabilitated and maintained where they are affected by the proposal. The riparian zones are to consist of local native plant species. The plantings should emulate the ecotone of vegetation naturally or previously occurring along the riparian vegetation.	Noted. Appropriate measures to address this issue will be included in the CEMP, which will include the use of locally endemic plant species.
Department of Water and Energy	100	Erosion and sediment control measures are to be implemented prior to any works commencing at the site and must be maintained for al long as necessary after the completion of works to prevent sediment and dirty water entering the watercourse. These control measures are to follow relevant management practices as outlined in Landcom's (2004) *Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction*.	Noted. As stated in SoC no. 37, the proponent will include soil and water management measures as part of the CEMP for the control water quality and hydrology impacts during construction of the Project. The measures will be consistent with the principles and practices outlined in Landcom's (2004) *Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction*. These measures will be developed prior to the commencement of construction.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Department of Water and Energy	101	Adequate measures must be in place to ensure the development does not impact on saline groundwater.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 41.
Department of Water and Energy	102	The development must demonstrate the following: ▪ The proposed development will have no or minimal impact on local and regional salinity processes. ▪ Salinity will have no or minimal impact on the proposed development. ▪ The development will have no or minimal impact on recharge to groundwater systems. ▪ The clearing of vegetation associated with the development is minimised.	As described in Section 3.7.2 of the Environmental Assessment, further geotechnical investigation would be undertaken during detailed design to obtain information on the site hydrogeology. In addition, SoC no. 34 states that detailed design would be undertaken to minimise any impacts in association with the project on identified saline groundwater. As described in Section 5.1.2, vegetation clearing has been reduced during the refinement of the project design as described in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Assessment. Modifications to the utility corridor have avoided the clearing of 0.08 hectares of Alluvial Woodland and 0.19 hectares of Shale Plains Woodland. Furthers Measures to minimise vegetation clearance requirements for the Project would be documented as part of the CEMP. This would include the identification of sensitive areas during the construction process as 'no-go' areas. Where possible, revegetation of areas disturbed by construction of the Project would be undertaken, thereby increasing the habitat value and visual amenity of the areas.
Landcom	103	Concerned about the impact the relocation of Schofields Station will have to the suburb, existing community, shops, commercial premises and services at the current station site.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 4 and no. 6.
Landcom	104	The Environmental Assessment does not make any effort to support the existing Schofields town centre or provide any ongoing connection between the centre and the new station location.	Chapter 5 of the EA provide the option addressed and the justification for the preferred option of relocating Schofields Station. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 6.
Landcom	105	The future town centre to the east of the new Schofields Station could be at least 10 to 15 years from commencement, the convenient access routes for rail commuters should be more comprehensively addressed.	Refer Section 3.3.2 of the report.
Landcom	106	The Environmental Assessment fails to adequately consider the noise and vibration impacts to planned future communities in the locality. Adequate details for proper consideration of the likely impacts were not provided. This particularly a concern for both precincts for which exhibition closed in February 2009, and rezoning is expected in late 2009.	Refer Section 3.3.1 of the report for discussion on impacts to future land use.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Landcom	107	The key management commitment to undertake ongoing consultation with the GCC and Blacktown City Council to reduce potential noise and vibration impacts on the future environment by appropriate land use zoning of surrounding areas during precinct planning is not appropriate for Alex Avenue and Riverstone Precincts. The approach undertaken does not represent good planning, and discriminates against the interests of landholders in the vicinity of the rail corridor.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 34.
Landcom	108	Landcom believes the assessment and proposed management of the operational noise impacts of the project is contrary to the DGRs as a suitable mitigation measure.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 34.
Landcom	109	It is reasonable for TIDC to accept responsibility for the potential impacts of the new infrastructure on the future land uses, particularly in the Alex Avenue and Riverstone precincts where rezoning is imminent.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 34.
Landcom	110	Any necessary noise attenuation measures should be constructed by TIDC within the rail corridor in consultation with the adjoining land owners. It should not be the responsibility of the landowner to adjust possible future zones to provide a noise buffer along the rail corridor – such an outcome would represent an extremely inefficient use of future urban land.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 34.
Landcom	111	TIDC is requested to provide a revised noise and vibration assessment for the Alex Avenue and Riverstone precincts. The process should involve consultation with the GCC, Blacktown City Council and key landowners to determine appropriate assumptions about future land uses. This is consistent with the statements made in the Project application report in relation to the detailed assessment of this issue.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 34.
Landcom	112	TIDC should provide a revised Statement of Commitments in relation to the provision of noise attenuation measures.	Noted. Refer to SoC no. 26 and 27.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Landcom	113	Concerned about the details of the proposed retaining wall in the vicinity of Schofields Road. In this location, the new tracks are proposed on the eastern side of the railway corridor, immediately adjoining Landcom's Alex Avenue landholding. The report fails to provide any details about the configuration of the retaining wall or its relationship to the adjoining lands. Landcom requests that TIDC provide an indicative cross section so that it can consider the likely effect of the retaining wall.	The plans provided in the Environmental Assessment are based on concept plans which are preliminary to detailed plans, which are currently being developed. An indicative cross section of the retaining wall in the vicinity of Schofields Road is provided in Figure 4-3.
Landcom	114	Requests the inclusion of the following revised SoCs: ▪ SoC no. 27a – the proponent will undertake a revised assessment of the potential noise and vibration impacts for the Alex Avenue and Riverstone precincts, and will consult with the Department of Planning (Growth Centres), Blacktown City Council and key landholders to determine appropriate assumptions for future land uses adjoining the rail corridor. ▪ SoC no. 27b – the proponent would design and construct noise attenuation walls as required to ensure noise and vibration levels do not exceed the criteria set out in the Interim Guidelines for the Assessment of Noise from Rail Infrastructure Projects (DECC 2007) on future land uses in Alex Avenue and Riverstone Precincts. The design and implementation of the mitigation measures shall be undertaken in consultation with the affected property owners.	TIDC does not propose to revise these SoCs. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 34.
DECC	115	**Noise and vibration** *Construction noise* The mitigation measures described in Section 9.9 of the noise and vibration assessment are generalised in nature and no specific mitigation measures have been committed to. The Department notes that the EA references TIDC's Construction Noise Strategy and agrees that a noise management plan should be developed and implemented to minimise noise impacts from construction activities.	Noted. Refer to SoC no. 24. A Noise and Vibration Plan will be developed as part of the CEMP which will provide details of the specific mitigation measures that would be adopted for the Project, including out-of-hours protocols, complaint management, temporary shielding, and the selection of construction equipment.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
DECC	116	*Construction compounds* Construction compounds should be located away from noise sensitive receivers to avoid impacts on these receivers. Where this is unavoidable, compounds should be designed to provide acoustic shielding to noise sensitive receivers.	Noted. Where possible, the compounds have been chosen to be located away from residents and will be configured such that the building structures provide acoustic shielding.
DECC	117	*Operational noise impacts and mitigation* The Department notes that a recent study found that the use of rail noise dampers in NSW did not provide the 3 dBA attenuation assumed in the noise and vibration assessment. Any proposed noise mitigation measures should be demonstrated to be effective prior to their use on the project.	The detailed design process involves undertaking further detailed operational noise assessments in accordance with Department of Climate Change's (2007) *Interim Guideline for the Assessment of Rail Noise Infrastructure Projects* (IGANRIP). Where operational rail noise levels are confirmed to exceed the IGANRIP trigger levels, an investigation into reasonable and feasible mitigation measures will be undertaken for these locations to ensure compliance with IGANRIP. These measures would be developed during detailed design in consultation with DECC and affected land owners. The effectiveness of any particular mitigation measure will be determined within the reasonable/feasible process prior to being proposed for implementation.
DECC	118	The assessment of ground-borne noise that is proposed to be undertaken during the detailed design also needs to consider noise mitigation measures.	Noted. To be included in the next stage of mitigation measures particularly if noise walls are being proposed.
DECC	119	The noise and vibration assessment appears to indicate that the vibration criteria will be exceeded for some train passbys, however no mitigation is proposed. The department expects that appropriate mitigation measures are implemented for any exceedances of criteria.	The assessment of vibration against the criteria indicates that there is no exceedance of the vibration trigger levels as expressed in the IGANRIP (or criteria as referred to in the DECC guideline). However, even though vibration levels do not exceed the trigger levels, some people may perceive vibration levels below these trigger levels.
DECC	120	*Operational noise impacts from bus interchanges* The noise and vibration assessment relied on the awakening levels provided in Appendix C of the ECRTN. The Department does not consider this awakening level to be appropriate for the assessment of potential sleep disturbance from maximum noise levels. The appropriate criteria for maximum noise levels are based on the background + 15 dBA.	As discussed in 8.4 of the Noise and Vibration Assessment (refer Technical Paper 2 in Volume 2 of the EA), the potential for sleep disturbance was only an estimate of the likely impact as the exact locations of future potential receivers are currently unknown (as the new Schofields and Vineyard Stations are planned to form the centre of the Schofields and Vineyard Growth Centre Precincts). Therefore external L_{Amax} noise levels were calculated for a variety of offset distances. The calculations were based on a bus L_{Amax} sound pressure level of 87 dBA at 7 m. Assuming an offset distance of 30 m (typical nearest residential receiver location), the calculated external L_{Amax} noise level is 70 dBA. This would correspond to an internal noise level of 60 dBA, assuming windows open, and less than 50 dBA assuming windows closed.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
			Whilst this level exceeds the 55 dBA criterion, this represents no change to the "existing" exposure levels of these receivers, given their locations are subject to other heavy vehicle usage such as large trucks. As stated in SoC no. 27 (refer Table 6-1), '*following completion of construction, operational noise monitoring shall be undertaken to confirm compliance with the predicted noise levels identified in the Environmental Assessment. Should the results of monitoring show that the Project specific noise levels are exceeded, then any additional feasible and reasonable mitigation measures shall be implemented in consultation with the affected property owners.'*
DECC	121	The Department concurs with the statement in the noise impact assessment that it would be advantageous if this assessment is revisited once the design development and GCC planning processes are further progressed.	Noted.
DECC	122	**Biodiversity** *Application of the Growth Centres SEPP* Biodiversity certification does not apply to projects for which approval is sought under Part 3A of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. As such, biodiversity certification does not apply to the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication. The Department considers it should be assessed and offset in accordance with the Part 3A Guidelines.	Refer Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 (*Flora and fauna: management of impacts*).
DECC	123	*Offsets* No Offsets are proposed for the 4.6 ha of endangered ecological communities or threatened flora species that are to be cleared for this Project, as TIDC considers that biodiversity certification under the Growth Centres SEPP applies to the Project and therefore these offsets have already been accounted for. The department does not consider that the Growth Centres SEPP applies to the Project and therefore any biodiversity impact will need to be adequately offset. Offsets should be developed in consultation with the Department and in accordance with the Principles for the use of biodiversity offsets in NSW. The identification of suitable projects and funding arrangements would need to be decided on prior to the commencement of construction works. The provision of biodiversity offsets needs to be included in the Statement of Commitments.	Refer Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 (*Flora and fauna: management of impacts)*.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
DECC	124	*Endangered Ecological Communities* The Environmental Assessment states that areas of ecologically endangered communities (EECs) were re-assessed but were not considered to be EECs because they were small and consisted largely of scattered trees. However, the side of the area is not relevant when determining whether vegetation meets the definition of an EEC, and vegetation should be regarded as the EEC (albeit in a degraded form), unless the understorey is entirely exotic and there is no native seedbank.	While the Environmental Assessment described areas of EEC as small fragmented patches, the assessment did not use this as a basis for determining whether vegetation meets the definition of an EEC. During field surveys undertaken for the Project, it was determined that some vegetation did not meet the definition of an EEC as: ▪ it is considered not to contain enough indigenous species to re-establish the characteristic native understorey ▪ regrowth was unlikely to achieve a near natural structure.
DECC	125	Figure 4-1 of the Biodiversity Technical Paper still does not include EECs mapped as polygon class TXU in the *Native Vegetation of the Cumberland Plain, Western Sydney* (NPWS 2002). This figure should include this category for consistency.	Noted. Refer Figure 4-5 and Section 4.2.8 of the report.
DECC	126	*Additional fauna surveys* No details are included in the environmental assessment on the methods or effort applied in the fauna survey (except for the Cumberland Land Snail). The Department assumes that a number of species that are listed as likely to occur (e.g. bats and owls) were not surveyed. If it is not possible to do additional surveys, then the assessment must assume that all the likely species are present and be carried out on this basis. It appears the assessments were done on this basis, however the assessment does not clearly state this.	Surveys of the rail corridor were undertaken on 19 September 2007. Surveys on private properties were undertaken on the following dates: ▪ 6 February 2008 ▪ 8 April 2008 ▪ 7 May 2008 ▪ 2-3 September 2008 ▪ 11 March 2009. The surveys assessed the extent and condition of vegetation communities and flora and fauna habitat. Survey effort and design was based on the Department of Environment and Climate Change *Impact Assessment Guidelines* (Department of Environment and Climate Change 2007c) and species specific guidelines (e.g. National Parks and Wildlife Service 2000). With the exception of the Cumberland Land Snail, additional targeted surveys were not completed for other fauna. As stated in 3.6.1 of the Environmental Assessment, '*where the survey was undertaken outside the optimal time for detecting some species, a precautionary approach was taken that involved the assumption that species were present if suitable habitat was identified.*' Additionally, the tests for significance completed for Threatened ecological communities, populations and species that were either: ▪ recorded in the study area, or

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
			▪ recorded in the locality, with potential to occur in the study area; assumed that the species was present, hence clarifying DECC's assumptions.
DECC	127	*Indirect impacts* Discussion of indirect impacts from the operational phase of the proposal is limited. The operation of the proposed car park and bus interchange at Vineyard Station is likely to greatly increase the level of weed invasion, rubbish dumping and edge effects on this remnant. The Environmental Assessment should discuss whether indirect impacts from the proposal will reduce the size of any remnant to a critical level, where their long term viability will be questionable.	Indirect impacts were discussed in Section 8.6.2 of the Environmental Assessment, and Chapter 6 of the Biodiversity Technical Paper (refer Volume 2 of the EA). TIDC will continue to consult with the Strategies and Land Release Branch throughout the development of the NWGC, particularly with regard to the Vineyard township proposed adjacent to the Vineyard Station commuter car park, to ensure indirect impacts from the operational phase of the proposal are managed appropriately.
DECC	128	*Carpark* The Department supports the conclusion of Technical Paper 5 – Biodiversity Assessment that the final location of the new Vineyard Station car park, including Phase 2, and bus interchange be configured to minimise impacts to threatened biodiversity as much as possible by considering other locations for the Phase 2 carpark, such as the west of the rail corridor where the vegetation has been previously cleared and grazed.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 49 and no. 50.
DECC	129	*Assessments of significance* The assessment of significance provided in Appendix E of Technical Paper 5 – Biodiversity Assessment should be repeated as it appears in the EP&A Act, as changing the wording can change the meaning of each section.	The assessment of significance provided in Appendix E of Technical Paper 5 is repeated as it appears in the draft *Guidelines for Threatened Species Assessment*. The wording presented in Appendix E is as per this guideline. Projects assessed under Part 3A of the EP&A Act are not assessed in accordance with the Section 5A of the Act (the Seven Part Test), but rather following the draft Part 3A guidelines.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
DECC	130	There is an error in Appendix C of Technical Paper 5 – Biodiversity Assessment, as the footnote for the column *likelihood of occurrence* states that if the likelihood is high, then a species was recorded during the current survey. It is noted that a number of species are recorded as having a high likelihood of occurrence; however no threatened species were recorded on site.	The footnote is correct. The assessment however did not include an additional note for the Cumberland Plain Land Snail which would have clarified this inconsistency. This additional note would have suggested that despite the likelihood of occurrence as being assumed high, actual targeted searches for the species conducted found no live specimens or shells of the Cumberland Plain Land Snail were identified within the study area. Given that additional surveys were not carried out, then the assessment assumes that the species is present given that potentially suitable habitat for this species exists in remnant Cumberland Plain Woodland and Shale Gravel Transition Forest. Refer to Ref 126 on assessment methodology.
DECC	131	*Construction compounds* Where construction compounds are proposed to be located in areas that have vegetation, the vegetation should be protected wherever possible. Fencing should be used around trees to prevent parking or equipment storage within the drip line of the trees. An ecologist should be consulted regarding the design of the site compounds.	A Flora and Fauna sub plan will be developed for the Project as part of the CEMP, which will provide details of the specific mitigation measures including protection of retained vegetation.
DECC	132	**Floodplain risk management** *Risk categories* The low flood risk category mapping presented in the Environmental Assessment is directly based on the probability of occurrence. However, risk also depends on the consequences of flooding, such as property and infrastructure damage, threat to safety and people, loss of business profitability and downtime and recovery. Basing the low risk from flooding on probability alone, particularly in the Hawkesbury River flooded areas, may not be appropriate because of the significant depths of flooding and greater potential for severe flood damages above the 100 year flood level. Accordingly, some of the low risk areas shown in Figures 8-12a to 8-12e may in reality be medium or high risk.	The hazard categories are based on the probability of occurrence of flood, not on the consequence, which is consistent with the Blacktown City Council (BCC) flood extent map. The maps were produced by BCC, in consultation with the Strategies and Land Release Branch.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
DECC	133	The Environmental Assessment refers to the Probable Maximum Flood as having a 1 in 10,000,000 change of occurring. This number suggests the PMF is much rarer than that suggested in previous studies. For example, the *Warragamba Flood Mitigation Dam EIS – Flood Study – Part D Flood Estimation*, October 1994, suggests a figure of 1 in 100,000 for the subject area resulting from Hawkesbury River flooding.	The Environmental Assessment considers the PMF as a 1 in 10,000,000 chance of occurring is consistent with that used by the Strategies and Land Release Branch in the development of the precinct plans (GHD 2008).
DECC	134	*Culvert capacity* Have all relevant culverts been included in the assessment?	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 40.
DECC	135	Basis for headwater calculations (including whether adequate allowance has been made of downstream tailwater levels/Submergence affects).	For the Stage 1 detail design, RLA has calculated headwater using culvert analysis program CDMD (Sinclair Knight Merz software) which utilises HECRAS equations. Culvert inlet geometry and tail water levels have been considered in this analysis. It is considered that adequate allowance has been made of downstream.
DECC	136	Assumptions on potential culvert blockage due to vegetation debris, litter etc.	As part of the detailed design process for Stage 1, the RLA has reviewed the culverts along the alignment. This has included a number of inspections of the culverts. It was concluded during this process that the proposed culvert openings are large and are not likely to block to the extent that it requires specific consideration. Therefore this has not been considered in the analysis, which is viewed as adhering to standard industry approach. The greater risk of blockage would be due to maintenance issues of the drainage lines. Therefore during operation, it is important for Council and RailCorp to maintain inlet and outlet drainage lines to ensure there is no blockage.
DECC	137	Details of the assessment/acceptability of potential upstream and downstream impacts on existing properties (beyond the rail corridor) from the proposed culverts (with blockage) over a range of local flood events.	As part of the detailed design process for Stage 1, RLA has confirmed that there would be no adverse impact on the existing properties both upstream and downstream of the culverts for storms ranging from 1 in 1 year to 100 year ARI. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 136.
DECC	138	Is it correct that the local flood impacts have been appropriately assessed, even in areas where the Hawkesbury River backwater controls peak flood levels?	This is correct. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 137.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
DECC	139	*Design Standard* The adopted standard needs to ensure acceptable safety and serviceability of the rail system, given the number of culverts spread along the line with varying potentials for blockage due to local flooding.	The 1 in 50 year ARI event has been considered for the design of culverts as per the RailCorp Standard. The proposed track vertical alignment is the same as the existing track and therefore the duplication will not impact the safety and serviceability of the rail system compared with the existing situation.
DECC	140	The Environmental Assessment suggests that the flood impacts resulting from the proposed works (including filling) will be based on flooding up to the 1 in 100 year ARI event. This may not be totally acceptable from a risk management perspective. Consideration of the impacts from rarer floods may be required in some instances. For example, the assessment may need to include the known 1867 flood of record type event, which is approximately a 200 year event, in areas affected by Hawkesbury River backwater.	A qualitative assessment of this issue indicates that during a 1 in 200 year event, a significant length of the rail line will overtop and the culvert size and performance is no longer a factor than the track level. To calculate the actual 1 in 200 year impact would require significant additional modelling in above and beyond what RailCorp/ BCC require.
DECC	141	*Detail design phase* Confusion over how much detailed assessment has been undertaken as part of the EA process. Page 386 of the report suggests that the local flood impacts have been considered in detail (but details of how this was carried out are not provided in the report), page 389 states that a detailed flood assessment would be prepared during detailed design of the project. The detailed assessment should be undertaken early in the planning phase of the project and must account for the impacts of climate change.	The detailed design process for Stage 1 is being undertaken in parallel with the EA. Work undertaken for the detailed design has contributed to the proposal in the EA, and is being further refined as the detail design is finalised for consultation with stakeholders prior to construction of the project. There is no specific standard for climate change to incorporate changes in rainfall intensity patterns. However, a freeboard allowance ('safety factor') is included in the design which provides a significant buffer and allows for uncertainties such as increase in peak flows due to climate change. The freeboard allowance on 500 mm has been incorporated into the culvert design and flood analysis. This approach has been adopted by other agencies including Melbourne Water.
DECC	142	*Modelling* The report does not indicate what sort of modelling approach has been used to assess the flood impacts and determine the culvert sizes. Accordingly, comments on the acceptability of the approach used cannot be made at this time.	The modelling undertaken by Maunsell (2007) for the Environmental Assessment used the program – Culvert Master. The modelling undertaken by RLA for the Stage 1 works used the CDMD software program. Both modelling software programs are accepted industry standard systems as is HECRAS.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
DECC	143	*Other floodplain development* It will be necessary to consider any future plans Blacktown City Council has for areas adjacent to the railway corridor, which may be impacted by the rail duplication proposal.	Modelling specifically undertaken by the RLA for the detailed design process of Stage 1, which has concurrently been compared with the BCC RAFTS model results, indicates that the upgrades to the culverts will generally result in a matching of existing culverts and this will have no significant impact on the stormwater flow characteristics or flood potential on neighbouring properties compared to the existing conditions. In undertaking investigations for Stage 1 detailed design, the RLA has adopted more conservative flow rates than those adopted by BCC, and consequently, the predicted impact will be more conservative. Nevertheless, the results indicate that the impact on the flood level (or height) will either remain as per current or be slightly reduced risk/impact (refer Table 3-3).
DECC	144	*Flood evacuation* The report suggests that the project will not exacerbate existing flooding behaviour of key evacuation routes or critical buildings. However, will the proposed rail duplication have any flood evacuation function? If it does, the design, including rail levels and culverts, may need to be modified to accommodate this function. The State Emergency Service may need to be consulted on this issue.	The rail line is not part of any flood evacuation route as it may not be possible to guarantee electricity supply for trains during floods to allow the trains to be able to operate.
DECC	145	*Railway stations* There appears to be no specific details relating to the management of flooding around railway stations and car parking areas. It is understood from page 379 of the report that these details will be covered in the detailed design phase.	Confirmed. This will be considered further. However during times of flood it is unlikely that trains would be operational. As such, the use of the railway stations and car parking areas would be limited during such events.
DECC	146	**Aboriginal cultural heritage** All recommendations contained in Section 8 Management Recommendations of the Indigenous heritage assessment report should be adopted (incorporating the following comments in relation to Recommendations 5 and 7).	Noted.
DECC	147	*Recommendation 5: Care and Control Permit for sites QV3, QV4 and QV5* An application for a Care Agreement for Aboriginal objects is required from the Department if the objects are collected/relocated and maintained by an Aboriginal community group.	Noted. This will be discussed with the Aboriginal Community and DECC.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
DECC	148	*Recommendation 7: Monitoring of areas not marked for further archaeological management* The department does not support monitoring during earth moving works. The Department would like to be consulted regarding the research design for the archaeological subsurface testing and any resulting salvage work that is to be undertaken prior to development.	Noted. While this recommendation was included in the Indigenous Heritage Technical Paper, it was not included in the draft Statement of Commitments for the Project (refer to Chapter 12 of the Environmental Assessment).
DECC	149	**Sediment and erosion control** The proponent must develop an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) for each section of the project site to manage risks of erosion and subsequent sediment deposition. The ESCP should address issues such as the construction of culverts to ensure that their construction is managed to prevent erosion and the pollution of waters. The Department recommends that vegetation is left in place for as long as possible and is only removed immediately prior to the commencement of construction as vegetation cover will protect the soil from erosion by rain and wind. Appropriate erosion and sediment controls must be put in place before the vegetation is removed.	Noted. This will be included as part of the CEMP.
DECC	150	**Land contamination** Phase 2 assessments must be undertaken in accordance with the Department's guidelines for contaminated sites and be completed prior to the commencement of construction.	Noted. The Phase 2 assessments will be undertaken in accordance with these guidelines and will be completed prior to the commencement of construction in any particular area.
DECC	151	To prevent any future contamination of land or water, all hazardous materials and dangerous goods should be stored in a bunded, roofed area this is not at risk of being flooding during extreme weather events.	Noted. This will be included as part of the CEMP.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
DECC	152	**Air quality and greenhouse gases** Bike storage facilities should be provided at the new stations to encourage local residents to ride their bikes to the station rather than taking their cars to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases during the operation of the project. Bike facilities should be provided at Riverstone Station to cater for future demand.	Noted. The provision of bike racks and space for bike lockers at the Schofields, Riverstone and Vineyard stations would be determined during detailed design in consultation with the Ministry of Transport (MoT) and RailCorp. The current design for Schofields Station indicates that approximately 40 bike racks will be provided at the new Schofields Station, as well as concrete padmounts to allow RailCorp or MoT to provide bike lockers. The cyclist facilities that will be provided by the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication will allow for integration with the Strategies and Land Release Branch's plans for cycle paths as proposed in precinct planning documents for the NWGC, where this information is available. An indicative plan of cycle paths proposed to be developed by the Strategies and Land Release Branch is shown in Figure 4-4.
DECC	153	**Environment Protection Licence** An Environment Protection Licence (EPL) under the *Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997* will be require for railway system activities during construction and operation and for extractive activities during construction. An EPL is required for the extraction, processing or storage of more than 30,000 tonnes of extractive materials per year. Approximately 76,900 cubic metres of material is anticipated to be extracted during the project, with approximately 40,999 cubic metres to be excavated during Stage 1.	Noted.
DECC	154	**Draft Statement of Commitments** *Environmental Management Systems* SoC no. 5 should include more detail on the issues and level of detail that should be included in the CEMP. For example, the CEMP should include details on sediment and erosion control measures, contaminated soil management, vegetation management, noise and vibration etc.	Noted. SoC no. 5 has been amended to provide further detail on the issues and level of detail that should be included in the CEMP. It is also noted that the CEMP will require approval prior to the commencement of construction.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
DECC	155	*Traffic and transport* The Department suggests that further investigations and consideration of alternative sites for both Phase 1 and 2 of the Vineyard carpark should be conducted, as the development of the carpark in the proposed location is expected to result in the removal of 0.97 ha of existing vegetation including good condition EEC.	Noted. Refer also to TIDC's response to ref. no. 49 and no. 50.
DECC	156	The Department recommends that there is a SoC to provide bike facilities at the stations to meet future demand (say 2031), not just for the demand upon opening.	It is not proposed to include all facilities to meet the 2031 demand at the opening of the Project. Additional facilities can be provided as demand warrants. There are also opportunities to incorporate facilities into the Strategies and Land Release Branch precinct plans as they develop.
DECC	157	*Noise and vibration* The project will require an environmental protection licence (EPL) which will include requirements regarding working hours, communication protocols and noise and vibration. TIDC will be required to comply with the requirements of the EPL and this will override any requirements set out in TIDC's Construction Noise Strategy.	Noted.
DECC	158	SoC no. 25 should be amended to state the following: *Construction activities will be undertaken between the hours of 0700 and 1800 Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 Saturdays and no work on Sundays or public holidays, except as otherwise provided for in the Environmental Protection Licence for the Project*.	Noted. SoC no. 25 has been amended to include reference to the Environmental Protection Licence; however reference to other relevant authorities has also been included in this SoC as they also have a role in determining construction working hours.
DECC	159	*Water quality and hydrology* SoC no. 33 commits the proponent to developing a Flood Impact Assessment. This assessment should include consideration of the impacts of climate change particularly in relation to culverts that cross the rail corridor and stormwater drainage systems.	Noted. Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 43 and no. 141.
DECC	160	SoC no. 35 commits to soil and water management measures being included as part of the CEMP. The proponent should also develop individual Erosion and Sediment Control Plans for each section of the project site.	Noted. This would be developed as part of the CEMP which would be prepared prior to the commencement of construction.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
DECC	161	The Draft SoCs should also include a commitment to harvest rainwater during both construction and operation for earthworks, dust suppression and landscaping.	Noted. Commitments to rainwater harvesting were detailed in Table 11-1 of the Environmental Assessment. SoC no. 52 states that TIDC would address all sustainability measures as identified in Table 11-1 of the Environmental Assessment. Refer also to TIDC's response to ref. no. 163.
DECC	162	*Contaminated land* The SoCs should include a statement of commitment that the Phase 2 Contamination Assessment will be completed prior to the commencement of construction.	Noted. No significant contamination has currently been identified. A Phase 2 contamination assessment would be completed prior to the commencement of construction. The SoCs have been modified to include a commitment for this (refer SoC no. 42).
DECC	163	*Waste, energy and demand on resources* Incorporating passive design and energy efficiency measures into station design, as mentioned on page 479 of the Environmental Assessment, should be included as a SoC.	Noted. Provision for these measures was detailed in Table 11-1 of the Environmental Assessment. SoC no. 52 states that TIDC would address all sustainability measures as identified in Table 11-1 of the Environmental Assessment. Refer also to TIDC's response to ref. no. 163.
DECC	164	*Sustainability in project design and delivery* SoC no. 49 states that the proponent would address all sustainability measures identified in Table 11-1. The Department recommends these commitments be individually detailed in the Draft SoCs, making these commitments more transparent and the proponent more accountable to the implementation of these commitments.	Noted. SoC no. 52 adequately covers all the measures referred to in Table 11-1. Including all of the measures in Table 11-1 as a SoC would result in the SoC table becoming too long and non-user friendly. A report will be prepared during the detailed design to address each of the items in Table 11-1.
Department of Defence	165	Defence owns land that is adjacent to the rail line and part of which (approximately 2.1 ha) will be acquired for the proposal.	Noted. As described in Section 5.1.2, the land acquisition requirement for the Project has been reduced due to the modified utility corridor that is proposed to be constructed on the western side of the rail corridor. In summary, the acquisition requirement of Department of Defence land has been reduced by approximately 25% (0.98 hectares). The total area of land that would be acquired from Department of Defence would be 2.9 hectares.
Department of Defence	166	Concerned about the potential adverse noise impacts on Commonwealth land that holds recognised residential development potential.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 34 and no. 106.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Department of Defence	167	The proposed action and Environmental Assessment ignores the future use of the Defence land as an important component of the NWGC. Without adequate noise mitigation measures, increased operational train noise will impact on the quality of life of the new residents and reduce the development potential and value of the Defence site.	The Environmental Assessment considers the proposed development of the NWGC in Sections 2.5.5, 3.1.1 and 8.1. At the time of writing the Environmental Assessment, little information was available on the Strategies and Land Release's plans for the Schofields precinct, of which the Defence land is located. Preliminary information released by the Strategies and Land Release Branch indicates that the Schofields precinct will be developed to contain high density development within town and neighbourhood centres (Department of Planning 2009). The precinct is expected to provide for approximately 5,000 dwellings and accommodate a population of 14,000 people (Department of Planning 2009). It is expected that the construction of a new station within the vicinity of the Schofields precinct will support the Strategies and Land Release Branch's plans for this precinct by accommodating the expected future patronage from the NWGC.
Department of Defence	168	The impact assessment demonstrated that operational noise impact on residences on the eastern side of the rail corridor would exceed levels and require noise mitigation measures to be adopted at the source; however, the impact assessment did not address the noise impact to the Defence land on the western side of the rail corridor.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 34 and no. 106.
Department of Defence	169	Defence requests that potential impacts from operational noise arising from the project on the Defence land be considered prior to any decision on the project and that appropriate measures to mitigate noise impact on the Defence site be a condition of approval. Appropriate measures could include the adoption of source control measures (such as rail dampers, low profile noise barriers and acoustic shielding). Alternatively TIDC could consider purchasing the affected land as part of the rail corridor and Defence would support the Priority Sale of the land (approximately 5 ha).	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 34 and no. 106.
Department of Defence	170	Defence considers that the mitigation measures should not be deferred and addressed at the rezoning stage, nor incorporated into land use planning measures for land that has been formally identified as future residential development under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. This course of action does not address the source of the problem and transfers the cost of rail management to private landholders rather than to the generator of the noise. It may	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 34 and no. 106.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
		also reduce the incentive on RailCorp to mitigate noise from rolling stock. Defence does not consider it appropriate for TIDC to pass the responsibility of providing adequate noise mitigation to the GCC (Department of Planning), Blacktown City Council, the Commonwealth and private land holders.	
Department of Defence	171	Whilst Defence will cooperate with TIDC in its acquisition of part of the rail corridor, Defence does not wish to be in a position where such a sale results in adverse impacts and a lower value for the adjacent Defence lands.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 34 and no. 106.
Ministry of Transport	172	The Ministry supports the proposal, which includes the planned relocation of Schofields Station in Stage 1 of the project. The Ministry acknowledges the consultation that was completed for the project. The Project justification appears sound and community concerns regarding key issues, such as the new Schofields Station, have been considered. The relocation of Schofields Station represents a 'whole-of-Government' position as noted in the Environmental Assessment.	Noted.
Ministry of Transport	173	The draft Statement of Commitments also includes a *Community and Stakeholder Involvement Plan* to address key stakeholder concerns noted during previous consultation.	Noted. This commitment has been included in the final Statement of Commitments for the Project (refer SoC no. 7).
Ministry of Transport	174	**Construction impacts** The Ministry notes plans to modify station access, commuter car parking, bus stops and bus routes during the construction of the project. It is imperative that the Ministry is consulted throughout the project to ensure bus services remain operational during construction of the project.	Noted. TIDC would continue to consult with the MoT throughout the pre-construction and construction phases of the Project.
Ministry of Transport	175	**Bicycle access and parking** The Ministry should be consulted during the detailed design phase of the Station interchanges to ensure safe bicycle access and adequate bicycle parking. These new bicycle parking facilities should also complement broader cycling initiatives to encourage the use of active transport across the region. Bicycle parking and access should be considered in the context of the new NSW Bike Plan.	Noted. TIDC will consult with the MoT with regards to the detailed design of the Station interchanges.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Ministry of Transport	176	**Interchange design** The Ministry continues to support the relocation of Schofields Station as it presents an opportunity to focus bus services on one key interchange, better integration of transport infrastructure with the proposed town centre, and improve access to the rail network for residents within the broader North West region. The Ministry also recognises the need to improve interchange facilities at Riverstone and to relocate Vineyard Station.	Noted.
Ministry of Transport	177	The Ministry suggests any proposed interchanges should reflect the *Guidelines For the Development of Public Transport Interchange Facilities* (September 2008).	Noted. TIDC would consider this guideline during the development of the detailed design of interchanges.
Ministry of Transport	178	The Ministry should be consulted during the detailed design phase for each of the proposed new and upgraded interchanges to ensure the development of a transport interchange facility that will meet the Government's transport objective.	Noted. TIDC would continue to consult with the MoT throughout the preconstruction and construction phases of the Project.
Ministry of Transport	179	The Ministry recommends the interchange design of the stations to provide appropriate levels of modal separation where possible. This includes: ▪ designated entrances and exits to the station and road network for cars and buses/taxis to reduce potential conflicts ▪ designated areas for each mode of access, including dedicated taxi stands clearly identified by appropriate parking controls, and dedicated and clearly indicated kiss-and-ride area for safe passenger set down and pick up. At Schofields, the provision of a signalised intersection should be considered at the intersection of Railway Parade and Pelican Road in order to provide a safer and more efficient interchange environment for all modes of access rather than a roundabout.	Noted. TIDC would consider these provisions during the detailed design phase of the Project, in consultation with the MoT. The provision of a signalised intersection has been considered at the junction between Pelican Road and Railway Terrace. The traffic numbers do not warrant a signalised intersection and a roundabout is the most appropriate junction arrangement. A signalised intersection would result in an increase in the average expected delay at the junction. Also the cost of signalise intersection would be considerably more than that of the roundabout option. It is recognised that traffic numbers may increase as a result of future development in the area and that the intersection may need to be upgraded accordingly. It is not known if or when this development will take place. Similarly the type, arrangement, capacity and even the location of any future junction is not known and will be dictated by future development requirements. It is expected therefore that intersection upgrades will be provided by others to match any future development.

Agency	Ref number	Issues raised	TIDC response
Ministry of Transport	180	**Commuter car parking** Commuter car parking at the new Schofields Station should be designed to accommodate forecast park and ride growth in the medium term, possibly up to approximately 10 years beyond completion. Provision for longer term commuter car parking should also be considered and included in the design, possibly through the identification of sites for additional commuter car parking within the station precinct.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 65.
Ministry of Transport	181	The Ministry has responsibility for the NSW Government's Commuter Car Park Program and commuter parking generally, and as such, any plans for additional commuter car parking should be directed to the Ministry for consideration.	Noted. Any revision of additional commuter car parking would be coordinated by TIDC, MoT and RailCorp.
Ministry of Transport	182	**Bus infrastructure and access** Future bus capacity and access requirements should be considered, including provision for expanded bus interchanges and potential layover facilities to serve each station as the region develops. The Ministry also recommends opportunities for bus priority to ensure reliable and direct bus access be investigated.	Refer to TIDC's response to ref. no. 64 for discussion on bus capacity accommodated at the new Schofields and Vineyard stations. The current Project design does not preclude the later provision of such bus infrastructure to accommodate future development if/when required.
Ministry of Transport	183	Other considerations in relation to bus infrastructure include: ▪ the future need to introduce new bus routes to the west of Schofields Station should be safeguarded through the design process ▪ the provision of a single major interchange facility on the eastern side of Riverstone Station to provide a hub for local and regional bus services, with future provision for bus stops on the western side to service new bus routes that will link Riverstone Station with Riverstone West ▪ The need to include bus stops for services operating in both directions at Vineyard Station, rather than a single interchange facility alongside the station entrance.	Noted. This is outside the scope of the Quakers Hill to Vineyard Duplication Project. Notwithstanding this, the current Project design does not preclude the later provision of such bus infrastructure to accommodate future development.
RailCorp	184	RailCorp is supportive of the proposal. It is acknowledged that a number of issues and suggestions highlighted in previous RailCorp correspondence for the Environmental Assessment Adequacy Review have now been addressed.	Noted.